

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Is it possible to teach theology to children? If it is possible, is it wise? Professor JOHNSTON ROSS believes that children may be taught even the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. That doctrine, he says, 'gathers round it ideas of the uttermost intellectual strain and of theological elaboration.' Yet he believes that if we do not endeavour to teach children the doctrine of the Holy Trinity we come very far short of our duty. The address or sermon in which the duty is urged will be found in the volume for January to June 1911 of the *Christian World Pulpit* (James Clarke & Co.; 4s. 6d.).

Now it is well to say at once that Professor JOHNSTON ROSS is neither a Chesterton nor a Liddon. He does not think in paradox, and he does not live in dogma. If he says that it is both possible and profitable to teach children what he calls 'the Church's dogma of the Holy Trinity,' it is because he has found it both possible and profitable. His conviction is, that in addition to the education of a child's moral sympathies two things are necessary for its right equipment for life as a spiritual being. These are, first, some direction for its thoughts of God, and, secondly, some stimulation and direction of worship.

He believes, you observe, that the child's moral

sympathies should be trained. In that he is at one with every earnest educator all the world over. He believes that the very first steps of a child's education should be the development of its moral sympathies by means of 'stories of instances of action or of passion of pronounced moral colour.' And he believes that the stories in the Old Testament can still be used successfully for that purpose, even although there may be grave doubt about their historical accuracy. 'It is felt,' he says, 'that whether the incidents happened or not, exactly as they are recorded, they are, exactly as recorded, morality-laden, and woo the child's sympathies over in the direction of right thinking and living.'

Then, as a lad grows out of childhood, this process should be continued. His attention should be directed to instances in general history of high moral choices. He should even be encouraged to admire living heroes and heroines of the moral life. But all that is only one part of the work of education. Along with the education in moral sympathies, and beginning with the child's earliest years, Professor JOHNSTON ROSS would carry an education in religion, even in the dogmas of religion, for he believes that behind the question of moral sympathies are the questions of God and of communion with God.

There is the question of God. Now there are in every child's mind three instinctive ideas about God. They are the ideas of His awfulness, His interest in us, and His omnipresence.

There is, first, the idea of God's awfulness. Native to a child, says Professor JOHNSTON ROSS, is an awe of God. It is a sense approaching to, or absolutely reaching, terror—terror of the greatness and the power of God. And this instinct may be over-stimulated till the child fatally misconceives God and cringes in an unholy dread before Him. There is at present a wide revolt against this over-stimulation. But Professor JOHNSTON ROSS warns us not to let the revolt carry us too far and deny to the child its very real natural awe of God.

Now this conception of God, august, majestic, awe-inspiring, is found in the Hebrew prophets as it is found in no other literature in the world. Did Jesus of Nazareth revolt from it? No. He ratified it. He spoke of God as a God of absolute righteousness. It is true, His thought of God was always the thought of God as a Father. And in this respect He passed beyond the prophets. While the prophets emphasized our responsibility to God, He drew out the other side and made known God's responsibility for us. But if God is responsible for us as a father is responsible for his children, does that lessen our responsibility to Him? If the judgment on sin is the judgment of a Father, does that make sin less sinful? In that word Father, says Professor JOHNSTON ROSS, everything is contained that is needed to feed and exercise the faculty and instinct of awe. 'If ye call on him as Father,' said St. Peter, 'pass the time of your sojourning here in awe.'

Next, a child has an instinctive and often a very beautiful belief in God's kindly interest in us all, and especially in the child himself. This lies in the mind of the child unreconciled with his belief in the awfulness of God, but not contra-

dicting it. And this belief may be stimulated without the fear that the other will suffer. For God's interest is not merely in the body. It is well to teach that God gives us 'life and breath and all things.' It is well to teach—

God, who made the earth,
The air, the sky, the sea,
Who gave the light its birth,
Careth for me.

But there are deeper needs than these. There is the need of a divine visitation of us in shame; there is need of comfort for conscience; there is need of humanly mediated pity and mercy and love; there is need of being drawn into fellowship with God, of finding in Him a permanent home.

Are those not the needs of a child? 'I answer that if you mean a child cannot articulate them I agree with you; but you must know very little of the desolation of which the adolescent heart is capable if you do not know that it will take the satisfaction of all these needs to fill up these desolations.' How are these needs to be met then? 'I believe,' says Professor JOHNSTON ROSS, 'they have never been met as they have by the story of Christ as a revelation and act of God—by the story of Christ as an incarnation of God, of His life as that of the Divine Son, and the Friend and Elder Brother of man, of His death as atonement, of His resurrection and glorification as the Son of Man in heaven—of the whole as a revelation of what I may call the potentiality of a humanity in God, the actual revelation of a Divine man.'

Then there is the child's sense of God's omnipresence. A child has a sense—sometimes comforting, sometimes embarrassing, sometimes terrifying—of God as penetrating all life and every obstacle. And no doctrine, it is Professor JOHNSTON ROSS's belief, has ever answered this instinct as the Christian doctrine of the Holy Ghost. For the Christian doctrine of the Holy

Ghost is the doctrine of God's present action upon our spirit. It brings to us the appeal from Christ, as well as from nature and from providence; it inspires prayer; it 'bears us up toward the supreme.'

Professor JOHNSTON ROSS is afraid that his cloud of words has carried us far away from the simplicity of childhood. But he insists upon his point. And his point is that childhood and youth have needs which cannot be satisfied by an education in moral sympathies—needs of a God which only the Christian conception of God as Father, Son, and Spirit can satisfy. He does not defend any creed or formula. He urges only that the elements out of which the dogma of the Trinity was formed are permanently necessary elements in a satisfactory conception of God, and ought to be in the background of any effective teaching of religion to the young.

But the child must not only have his thoughts rightly directed toward God, he must also be stimulated and directed in the worship of God. The right act must be made to follow the true thought.

Now the secret of acceptable worship is humility. 'What will it profit thee to be able to discourse profoundly,' says Thomas à KEMPIS, 'on the Trinity if thou art wanting in humility and so art displeasing to the Trinity?' And humility, rightly interpreted, means three things. It means the preservation of the sense of awe; it means the absence of abjectness; and it means the constant transformation of mere formality in worship into a worship that is in spirit and in truth.

Where, then, will humility, thus interpreted, be found? In the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. For the worship of the Father, conceived as Christ conceived Him, delivers us from presumption and preserves the saving awe and salutary fear. The worship of the Son delivers us from abject terror, for it reminds us of God's

present tender love for us and of our own future in God. And the worship of the Spirit, being the worship of a God within us, makes a merely formal approach to God an impossibility.

'I believe, then, in the simplicity that is in Christ, and that the essence of the Gospel can be grasped by a child. But simplicity is not superficiality; it is "the last expression of profundity." And whether one is teaching little children or trying to grasp Christianity for one's self, I believe one ought to resist the temper that is impatient of mystery and is fevered by the craze for simplicity. A God whom we can comprehend, let it be said for the thousandth time, is not a God whom we can worship.'

'Be pitiful, be courteous,' says St. Peter. But when? Be pitiful always; but be courteous in time of ease. Lord Hugh Cecil, writing to the *Times*, says it is superfluous to discuss questions of courtesy when we are passing through a revolution, for 'revolutions and manners do not belong to the same plane.' Whereupon the newspaper denies him even the originality of his remark. When a certain traveller by the train from Glasgow left his hat and gloves on the seat and returned to find them on the floor and his place occupied, he remonstrated: this was not the courtesy travellers should show one another. The answer was, 'Courtesy! Dae ye no ken this is the Glesca fair week?'

But Mr. William STEBBING does not agree with Lord Hugh Cecil or the Glasgow trippers. To him courtesy is a beautiful quality to be observed on all occasions and by all men. And in his new volume *Truths or Truisms* (Frowde; 4s. net) he gives a complete and precious chapter to its exposition.

He distinguishes courtesy from politeness. Politeness is polished manners, and not to be

undervalued. Politeness is a product of Civilization and among its best. It is the removal of pebbles from the road along which Civilization travels, and Civilization is glad to have the pebbles removed. Without any extraordinary attention to elevation of spirit, Civilization is determined that at least outward behaviour, where visible, shall be well rolled and smoothed. But politeness is not courtesy. 'Evenness of the surface, however dexterously it has been levelled, and the dissembling of natural crabbedness, have little or no affinity to the inner graces of the habit, or temper, of which I understand courtesy to be the flower and fruit.'

Courtesy is not one of the virtues. 'It is so amiable a creature,' says Mr. STEBBING, 'that I should like if the virtues could rank it among them.' But it always remains distinct. Indeed there are men who are, in Mr. STEBBING'S phrase, almost ultra-virtuous, and they have been conspicuous for the lack of courtesy. They will express their regret to a plain spinster that few young men now have the good sense to mistrust good looks. Or they will do some other and yet more distressfully maladroit thing.

Courtesy, says Mr. STEBBING, is a thing by itself. And so it cannot be defined. For you can define only by comparison. It is in action that it is discovered. It is never officious, never superfluous. It can administer rebuffs without bruising. It teaches a youth to argue against his seniors with so graceful a fire that, instead of resenting the tone of equality, they delight in the flattery of a forgetfulness of their years. 'It shines in all assemblages, and into all hearts. Any one, Prince or Peasant, may have it. Everybody, Prince or Peasant, having, must manifest it, for it cannot be hid. Nowhere are we insensible to its presence. How sweet breathes the air! How the gracious spirit generates its like! How, before it, every one has the feeling of being higher, better, kindlier.'

'Be pitiful, be courteous.' When? At all times. In Glasgow fairs and in revolutions.

'Where there is neither Jew nor Gentile.' Where? The Apostle meant in Christianity. But at the First Universal Races Congress, held in London last July, there was only one evangelical Christian present. There was only one man present who would say that he was a Christian entirely after the manner of St. Paul.

The Congress was held from the 26th to the 29th of July 1911, at the University of London. The papers which were read at it have been published in one volume under the title of *Papers on Inter-Racial Problems*, edited by G. SPILLER (P. S. King & Son; 7s. 6d. net). In his preface the editor of the volume tells us what the Congress was called for. The object of the Congress was 'to discuss, in the light of science and the modern conscience, the general relations subsisting between the peoples of the West and those of the East, between so-called white and so-called coloured peoples, with a view to encouraging between them a fuller understanding, the most friendly feelings, and a heartier co-operation.' That looks very like an occupation in which St. Paul would have taken part. Yet there was only one Pauline Christian present.

Lord WEARDALE, who was President of the Congress, writes an introduction to the volume. 'Nearer and nearer,' he says, 'we see approaching the day when the vast populations of the East will assert their claim to meet on terms of equality the nations of the West, when the free institutions and the organized forces of the one hemisphere will have their counterbalance in the other, when their mental outlook and their social aims will be in principle identical; when, in short, the colour prejudice will have vanished and the so-called white races and the so-called coloured races shall no longer merely meet in the glowing periods of missionary exposition, but, in very fact, regard

one another as in truth men and brothers.' That seems to say, not only that the object of this Congress was strictly Pauline, but also that it had not met before the time. It seems to say that if we believe that there is neither barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but all are one in Christ Jesus, we should have thrown all the weight of evangelical Christianity on the side of this Congress. Yet there was only one evangelical Christian there.

Mr. John M. ROBERTSON, who is a materialist, was there. Mr. Israel ZANGWILL was there, who is a Jew. Professor GENCHI KATO, of the Shinto religion of Japan, was there. But, while some Christians were there, one or two of whom might not refuse to be called evangelical, there was only one man present because he was an evangelical Christian. There was only one man who could say, 'I am here to testify that the gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.' Who was this? It was Dr. Alfred CALDECOTT, Professor of Moral Philosophy in King's College, London.

The question before the Congress was, How can the various races of the world be brought to see that the interest of one is the interest of all? That question well answered would be likely, first of all, to make for peace. And the cause of peace is the cause of Christ. But would it not be likely also to make directly for the progress of the gospel? Professor CALDECOTT believes that it would. He would have no race distinction obliterated. If the Turk becomes a Christian let him be a Turk still. Even if the Jew becomes a Christian let him still remain a Jew. Professor CALDECOTT believes that there is room for a Jewish Christianity that is not anti-Pauline, but is simply the Christianity of the Jewish race.

Remove the race-barrier, then, and you open the way to the entrance of the gospel. And the race-barrier is to be removed by recognizing the race. Let each race have complete liberty of conscience. Let each race, and every individual

of each race, have perfect liberty of choice whether they will retain their present religion or adopt another—then Professor CALDECOTT believes that the gospel of Christ will have free course and be glorified.

Now it is the Governments of the world that prevent the exercise of this liberty. The time has come when to every Government on the face of the earth the word should be sent, in the name of humanity, Hands off! 'What I think this gathering of representatives of the different Races is concerned to note is that in the propaganda of religion every one now agrees that it must be by absolutely voluntary effort: that by Churches, Societies, or individuals, but not by Governments, religions may be proclaimed all over the world. Two principles may well be asked for—

'That no Government shall disturb the political situation by including in its programme the propagation of its own religion, as distinguished from its maintenance;

'That no Government shall refuse to its subjects freedom to hear religious messages, or prevent them from accepting them if they so desire.'

These are fundamental principles. These principles, says Dr. CALDECOTT, express a right which may be generally accepted as lying at the root of the unification of mankind. And he is bold enough to proceed, in the presence of representatives of most of the world's religions, to point out what are the Governments that are denying that right. The Government of Spain, he says, and the Government of Russia within Christendom; the Governments of Turkey and Persia; the French Government. He does not charge the French Government with the intolerance of Turkey or Persia; but he says that the time has come when in French colonies official interference should be restrained as it is in the French Congo, and not exercised as it has so long been exercised in Madagascar.

Truthing it in Love¹

(ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ, EPH. IV. 15).

BY PRINCIPAL THE REV. JAMES IVERACH, D.D., ABERDEEN.

In the New Testament, Truth is used in a very wide sense. It is something to be believed, something to be thought, something to be done. In the Johannine writings in particular truth is something to be done. To do the truth is a frequent expression in these writings. At the same time stress is laid in them on the fact that it is something to be believed, and something to be thought. In our text the Apostle lays stress on the function of truth in social relations. Our Authorized Version brings out that aspect by supplying the verb 'speaking,' but the word supplied unduly limits the wide significance of the Apostle's meaning. The attitude towards truth is universal. It means not only that in social intercourse we are to have regard to truth, it means also that truth is to reign in the inward parts, that it is to rule conduct everywhere and always, that it is to rule our thinking, govern our acting, and inform our feeling. Truthing it, yet truthing it in love, so the Apostle sets forth the right attitude towards truth.

I have chosen this text, in response to the great task entrusted to me, because it briefly and fully sets forth what I owe to my Alma Mater, and what she seemed to say to me when many years ago she sent me forth to my life task, with the seal of her approval on my undergraduate course, when she granted me my degree. I had learned from my teachers to have supreme regard to truth as the mainstay of my feeling, my thinking, and acting. And also that I should never be able to approach truth if I did not love it for its own sake. I was taught by precept and example to recognize that there was a supreme objective standard of belief, of thought, and action.

Nor can I ever forget my debt to one of my teachers, the best teacher I have ever known, who first enabled me to recognize the unity of this universe, who told me and enabled me to see that there was a great objective order, fixed as the

stars, deep as the firmament, regular as the seasons, and that it was our business to find that order and submit to it. Peter Guthrie Tait was the name of that great master of mine, and I found it well to follow his teaching as far as I could. It was well for one to know that there is a great objective order, and that the proper attitude towards it was to ascertain what was the particular ongoing of it. So in mathematics and in physics, and in the physical sciences generally, we learned in this university to truth it, and to have regard to the truth of things, and to love to have it so. We learnt to know that our science at its best was simply an approximation to the great reality of the eternal order, and we sought ever to approach more closely to the great reality. But other questions speedily arose, and under the inspiration of Professor Campbell Fraser, happily still with us, we found that there were other questions not so easily answered. We came to doubt, to question, to hesitate, to ask what were the relations of the outer to the inner, what was our own contribution towards the order of things, and we were left with a number of unanswered questions, many of them still unanswered. But with all that process of hesitation, we found our conviction deepened that an answer could be found, that at all events in this mysterious universe we had to make the supreme venture, and that when we made it in faith and love the issue would be so far satisfactory.

What we learned in our classes might be said to be the constant exhortation to truth it in love; but we learned more than that. As we passed through the classes and passed from subject to subject, and from teacher to teacher, we ever learned that there was for each subject an ideal, a standard of worth, a measure of value, which, though varying from subject to subject, yet possessed abiding reality. We learned that truth was not only an objective standard, but also an inward reality. It was a property of things, it was also a spiritual quality. Truth was there in the universe, in the stable order, the

¹ A sermon preached in St. Giles Cathedral at the Commemorative Service of the University of Edinburgh, on 7th July 1911.

reciprocal rhythm of its action and reaction, its constant change and its ordered progress. Yet we learned to recognize truth in the making. We learned that Energy was constant, and could neither be increased nor diminished, yet this universe is in the making. And all the truth about it is not yet. We were taught to look at the great reality of a universe in its making at the hand of man; life in its evolutionary flow rising under pressure ever higher, passing from kind to kind, till at length there appeared a being on the earth who could reach backwards and so far read the story of the world's becoming. Then we were taught to regard with reverence the wondrous achievements of earth's highest creature. Languages, institutions, histories, governments, cities, empires in their rise, growth, decline and fall,—in all these more complex subjects we were taught to look for law, order, and method.

Thus we were taught that there were fixed beliefs of man, related to reality, beliefs which persisted, which no criticism could invalidate, which criticism itself presupposed, and which were, indeed, the very nerve of criticism itself. Then, too, we found that these irreversible, irresistible beliefs seemed to be ingrained in the structure of our intelligence, and without them there was no possibility of real, fruitful thought. Beliefs which at the outset were teleological, fitted to make us at home in this world in which we had found ourselves, subjected to after criticism, turned out to be of the nature of which the world itself was made.

But beyond these fixed irreversible beliefs, and beyond the fixed order of things, which our mother taught us to recognize, we found that she insisted on the recognition of other orders of things, no less real, no less worthy of our admiring study. She taught us to recognize the great world which man has made, and which man was making. She not only taught us, in the sciences, to recognize and submit to an order which we did not make, but she taught us, to see a world in the making. She not only showed us the world of principles, she taught us to see what ideals were, and how they were to be realized.

In her progressive evolution our Alma Mater has, increasingly with the years, recognized, and embodied in her teaching, these new worlds of human worth, of human purpose, and of the realization of human ideals. She had always recognized

these in the teaching of the humanities, and had made us acquainted with the glory of Greece and the splendour of Rome, had caused us to know the achievements of the human mind in the philosophies of the world; she has added to these other and equally important departures, in which she recognizes the ideals which rule human thinking in the worlds which are being made by human effort to-day. Music, architecture, art in general, history of human endeavour in all departments of effort, are being ever added to the wide culture of the university. But the main addition she has made lies in the fact that she trains men to recognize ideals, and to recognize that ideals are the ruling guides in the world which is being made by the work of man. Energy we can neither increase nor diminish, Gravitation works on ever and always without consulting us, Chemical elements abide, combine and recombine only on their own conditions; no efforts of ours can make contradictions true; the laws of true reasoning abide, and we cannot change them. Nor can we alter the fixed necessities which gird us around on every side. But under these conditions, and largely by the use of them, we are free to work out a world of our own, and it is in this world of purpose, of effort to realize ideals, that the freedom and the glory of man are really potent. So that we can see necessity is the mother of freedom, and because of fixed necessities results are free and ideals may be realized. If there were no fixities, if there were no necessities, no abiding laws, then there could be no rational beliefs, no game of progressive thought, no controlling action on the part of man. But within the rigid outline of these necessities we find room for ideals, for purpose, for the making of worlds which express our meaning, and fulfil our purpose. Gravitation works with us in the building of our palaces and our homes, Chemistry guides us to make new combinations which it will faithfully carry out to completion, Colours lend themselves to the making of those pictures which express the highest artistic meaning, and the light which streams in on us constantly, working in ways which can be expressed in absolute mathematical formulæ, suggests to the mind which grasps it that light which never was on sea or land, the consecration and the poet's dream.

On looking back across the years and trying to measure the debt I owe to my Alma Mater, I place first what she taught me regarding the fixities, the

necessities, the order which underlies all our thinking and acting, and constrains all our believing. To recognize these is the first step on the way to freedom, or rather they prescribe the sphere where-in freedom is to be realized.

But the university did not stop short with the description of these necessities; in her teaching she called on us to realize that the world is making, and that we are the people to make it. She taught us that in the clash of human wills, in the striving of men towards the realization of themselves and of the world in which they live and are to live, we were in the presence of a creative force of the most magnificent kind. Thus we learned that while there had been evolution in the world, guided by pressure from without and from within, up to man, there was also another kind of evolution, controlled not by pressure from behind, but guided by purpose, by ideals, by the adaptation of means to ends. So our Alma Mater led us into history, and though that history, so far as I was concerned, was only within selected periods, she gave me the principles on which all human effort within history was to be construed. She showed us a world in the making, a world ever taking on new meanings; that there was a record of these meanings in the languages, the literatures, the poesies, the philosophies, the sciences, the institutions of the world, and that these could not be understood if we did not add to the principles of explanation, drawn from the physical world mainly, that other principle which recognizes the creative energy of man, and his native power to new make the world in which he found himself, and to give to it a deeper, wider meaning.

Part of the function of a university is to make her sons and daughters aware of this newer world which has grown up within the older world disclosed to us by the sciences, and to enable them to discern the laws, principles, and meaning of this newer world; in a word, to make them able to recognize the worth of ideals as these are involved in the spiritual world in which man lives, a world made by man himself in interaction with the world given to him. The ideals are there in art, in science, and in literature; and the university teaches us to note these ideals, to recognize them, to test them, and to act on them. But we are taught also to recognize that these ideals are themselves progressive, that they have had a growth and an evolution in the past, that this

literature and that have contributed towards an evolution which we can see, but which has not yet come to its climax. It may be, too, that each race and nation has only contributed some element to the complete ideal, which in the true, the beautiful, and the good will form the highest ideal for man universally, in which event it is our business to ascertain what abiding elements of worth there may be in the culture of the past, and to help to set these forth in harmonious combination with all the other elements of worth, so as to form a whole which will commend itself, not to this race or to that, but to man universally. What are our ideals to be? and how are they to be realized? It is easy to ask these questions, and hard to answer them. But it is the part of a great university to ask them, and to answer them; at all events, to endeavour to answer them in such a way as to keep the question alive, and to keep the torch of truth ever burning.

So when in the great function of to-day, when our Alma Mater sends forth her sons and daughters, whom by academic test of a stringent kind she has found worthy to bear her name, and when she has recognized the worth of those who have successfully passed the tests of life, as they formerly passed the academic test in this or in other universities, and has graciously declared by the conferring of her degree on them that they have borne themselves worthily in the race, may I venture to say that she sends them forth to begin their life-work, or to continue it, in the spirit of our text, to truth in love. So she sends you forth to feed the high tradition of the race, to conserve whatsoever in the past is found worthy, but specially to exercise the function of creative evolution, and to take the inevitable next step for the evaluation of the ideal and the realization of it, which shall help in the making of man, the building up of character, and the realization of true social well-being. You who go forth to-day crowned with the approval of our Alma Mater form part of that small percentage of the human race to which we rightly look for light and leading, for stimulus and direction in the years to come. Trained, educated, and crowned, you go forth with the seal of approval on your university work, but you go forth to meet a more stringent test than that which you have passed. The test of life differs greatly from the academic test, yet

the one should prepare for the other; keep that disinterested love for the ideal which has been fostered here; keep that recognition of the necessities which guard belief and thought and action; maintain in all their freshness, purity, and lustre, those high hopes and great ideals which are your possession to-day; descend not to second-rate ideals of life or work, which are absolutely fatal to both. Never let work out of your hands less well done than you can do. Never say to yourself, this is not up to the mark, this is not so well done as I could have done it, had I taken more pains, but it will do, it will pass. Above all, despise not the dreams of your youth, nor the high visions of work for man which you cherished in the past. Joseph's dreams were prophetic of future reality. So are the dreams of every one, and the best work ever done by man was done in the fulfilment of the dreams of youth. Let it never be possible for you, when middle age comes, and when you review your past, to say, I was

young and foolish then, I dreamed of great things to be said, thought, and done, but I have learned common sense since then, and have learned to be content with common things. That is the tragedy of human life, that is failure in all the higher issues of life, and, though many have counted it success, yet in the sight of the eternal values it is the greatest failure possible. Truth is great, and to truth in love is the highest achievement of man.

Nor can I conclude without a reference to Him in whom grace and truth became, whose life was truth in love, who is the way, the truth, and the life, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and of knowledge, who is the realized ideal of humanity. Nay, He is more: He is set for the making of men, for the help and the strengthening of the weak, for the raising of the fallen, for the quickening of men into the higher life; who can and does pour into our broken lives the fulness of His own gracious life, who can make us men indeed.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE PSALMS.

PSALM CIII. 1, 2.

'Bless the Lord, O my soul;
And all that is within me, bless his holy name.
Bless the Lord, O my soul,
And forget not all his benefits.'

THE 103rd Psalm is written in the form of a monologue. It is a meditation. The Psalmist is alone with himself; he is speaking to his own soul. He is laying down a method for each good soul to examine itself. It is a Psalm of thanksgiving and of recollection.

I.

THANKSGIVING.

'Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me, bless his holy name.'

I. '*Bless the Lord.*' It seems perhaps at first a strange thing that we should call upon our souls to bless the Lord. It is a fitting and natural thing that we should call upon the gracious God

to bless us. But what can we give to Him? Herein is a great mystery, even the mystery of love! Love is a great want—God's love is a great want; love can only be satisfied with love. God had finished the earth; He looked upon it all in the freshness of its beauty; He saw it had just come forth from His hands. But He was not satisfied. He looked at it, and said of it all, 'It is very good.' Then He waited, and then He stooped and fashioned man. You see, there was not one creature in the world who could take hold of all its beauty and turn it into praise; there was not one creature in the world who could feel the great throbbing of His love and love Him back again; there was not one who could commune with Him, walk with Him, and enter into the mysteries of wisdom, and feel its power, and find its uses, and turn all these things into blessings to God. So our God stooped again and fashioned out of the earth a man; and then, when the man saw the worth of things, he thanked God for it; he found the uses of things, he blessed

the Lord; he traced love in everything; he loved God for it all. Then the heart of our Father was satisfied; He said, 'It is very good.'

In praising God, we perform one of the highest and purest acts of religion. It is vastly superior to many Christian duties; even to prayer, for in prayer we are in a special sense concerned with ourselves, while in praise we are specially concerned with God. In the sacrifice of praise we largely eliminate the element of self, and are like the angels in performing the unpolluted service of the skies. The sweet reasonableness of worship is patent to all who will think.¹

It is not the deed we do,
Though the deed be never so fair,
But the love, that the dear Lord looketh for,
Hidden with lowly care
In the heart of the deed so fair.²

(1) So we are only in the *right attitude towards God* when we are blessing Him, when we see ourselves as poor dependents upon His bounty, when we see that everything that comes to us comes from His great love. We bless Him by being thankful, by extolling Him for the gifts He has bestowed, by loving Him in consequence of His bounty towards us, and by allowing these emotions of our mind to influence our life, so that we speak well of His name, and act so as to glorify Him among our fellow-men.

(2) And we are only in the *right attitude towards all things* when we are blessing Him, when we take hold of the common things of the earth and turn them into praise, when we take hold of these gross things that are fashioned out of the dust and turn them into much better things by finding in them tokens of His love, when our gratitude goes up to thank Him for them all. It is not that we should be always engaged in the definite act of praise, for there are many other duties in which a great part of our time must be occupied; but the frame of our minds, the disposition of our hearts, should be always ready for this duty so as to be prepared for it whenever occasion may call for the performance of it.

We pray for much, but we praise too little. Some one has said that the Christian ought to be like a horse that has bells on his head; so that he cannot go anywhere without ringing them and making music. His whole life should be a psalm. Every step should be in harmony; every thought should constitute a note; every word he utters should be a component part of the joyful strain. Those are the people to recommend Christianity who go about their business like the High Priest of old who, wherever he went, made music with the golden bells.³

2. 'O my soul.' The Psalmist is anxious that his praise should be *sincere*. It is his *soul* and not his lips he addresses. He wants nothing formal, mechanical, lifeless, spiritless; he is anxious that his truest self, the real Ego, the essential I, should voice the gratitude he feels. Soulless worship is not worship at all. Not without good reason does the Psalmist insist in this song that his soul should take the lead in this delightful minstrelsy, for we are all liable to lapse into God-dishonouring formalities, to become drowsy and lethargic, to offer strange fire instead of the enthusiasms of the soul.

The soul is our active self, our vigour, our intensity. When we speak of a man's throwing his soul into a thing, we mean that he does it with all his might. We say, 'There is no soul in him,' by which we mean that he has no vigour or force of character, no love, no zeal. My intensest nature shall bless the Lord. Not with bated breath and a straitened energy will I lisp forth His praises, but I will pour them forth vehemently and ardently in volumes of impassioned song.

The one want of the world for all things is soul. If I hired a man to do up my bit of garden and I found him dawdling over his work, playing with the hoe, merely tickling the earth as if he expected it to laugh into flower-beds, I would fling him his half-crown, and say to him, 'Take it and go; I would sooner do it myself.' It irritates me to see a man doing work without a soul. Think of the great God who looks down upon all things. If thou put not thy soul into His service it is a dreary mockery. Man, if thou dost sing, sing from thy heart; if thou dost pray, let thy soul waken when thou comest to dwell with thy God; let thy soul be allured with quick ear and quick eye, with wings all spread ready to soar right up into the presence of the King. 'Bless the Lord, O my soul!'⁴

We know what the mood is against which the man in this Psalm is protesting. I do not know any more disheartening condition to be in, or one from which it is a more blessed and delightful thing to escape. It is not that we have fallen into religious doubts—although unless we take care it will come to that. It is not that we wish to be other than religiously-minded people. It is not at all that we envy people who live more carelessly than we can permit ourselves to do. It is not that we have a kind of hankering after things that are wrong or inconsistent with our obedience to Christ. It is not that we do not know the great Christian doctrines concerning God and concerning our duty. No, in a sense we have everything we really need; certainly we have often had much less and yet been better people. We know all those things about God—about His great patience with us, about His great love for us, about Christ, His great happiness in His Father, the glorious peace of His Cross, like the calm of mighty waters. We know also the

¹ J. Pearce.² C. G. Rossetti.³ J. Pearce.⁴ Mark Guy Pearse.

great hope and prospects of belief. Indeed, we know everything. But with all these things we are not *alive*. We are asleep under them. We have lost the spirit of praise. We do our duty in a dull, determined kind of way. We would walk miles in obedience to a commandment. Indeed, we are in that strange condition when the Law is easier for us than the Gospel; when we can obey, but when our soul will not, and simply cannot, 'bless the Lord.' We are like people who have taken a drug which covers us with a kind of numbness, and we feel that we shall not be ourselves until this cloud in our blood has passed. We know everything about God, but we rejoice in nothing. Things do not mean for us what they ought to mean, what they at one time did mean—what, unless God forsake us, they will yet again mean. That is the condition of the lonely man who in this Psalm cries out—with the hope of awakening himself, and making himself alive to God—

O thou my soul, bless God the Lord;
And all that in me is,
Be stirred up His holy name
To magnify and bless.¹

3. 'O my soul.' The Psalmist urges himself to *personal* adoration. He begins with himself, and although he goes out from himself and seeks to engage others in singing unto God, he comes back and concludes his exhortation with himself.

Every man for himself can sing unto the Lord a new song, and must sing it. There is ample scope for the play of our individuality, and in this hallowed engagement no man can act our part. We have in our care the keeping of our own soul—a soul unlike any other. We have our own path to tread—a path peculiarly unlike that of our neighbour. We have our own burdens to bear, our own duties to discharge, our own circumstances to mould, our own temptations to encounter, our own character to make, yes, and our own mercies to receive; and all these differentiate our life from others, and make particular paths along which the Great One comes to us. Thus, whatever song others may sing, they cannot sing ours. Singing by proxy there cannot be. 'Bless the Lord, O my soul.'

It is said that once when Sir Michael Costa was having a rehearsal with a vast array of performers and hundreds of voices, as the mighty chorus rang out with thunder of the organ and roll of drums and ringing horns and cymbals clashing, one man who played the piccolo far away up in some corner said within himself, 'In all this din it matters not what I do,' and so he ceased to play. Suddenly the great conductor stopped, flung up his hands, and all was still—then he cried aloud, 'Where is the piccolo?' The quick ear missed it, and all was spoiled because it failed to take its part. O my soul, do thy part with all

thy might! Little thou mayest be, insignificant and hidden, and yet God seeks thy praise. He listens for it, and all the music of His great universe is made richer and sweeter because I give Him thanks. Bless the Lord, O my soul.²

'The angels are present when we assemble for worship,' said the Venerable Bede. 'What will they say if they find me not there? Will they not ask, "Where is Bede? Why comes he not to prayers with his brethren?"'

4. '*All that is within me.*'—David stirs up his soul to praise the Lord. His praise is to be *whole-hearted*. 'All that is within me' means the *whole heart* as opposed to a *divided heart*.

(1) We are to praise God with the *unity* of our nature. Single-mindedness is held to be of such value that a man who possesses it is counted perfect. The perfect man in the Bible is not the man without fault, but the man of single-hearted devotion who loves and serves God. Faults in conduct, errors of judgment, infirmities of temper there may be in abundance. The one quality that redeems, ennobles, inspires character, is self-devotion, without reserve, to the divine kingdom of the gospel, to the cause that is worth living for. So if we are to worship at all we should do it with all that is in us. Worship means recognition of worth, doing homage to goodness. And even when the worth is limited, as in the case of a good man, the homage, the recognition, should be cordial. When the homage is offered to Infinite Goodness, all the gifts of mind and heart should be brought into play, so as to yield the maximum of worship and recognition. The Lord our God ought to be loved and served with all the heart, and soul, and strength, and mind.

(2) We are to praise Him with the *diversity* of our nature. Our nature is a many-stringed instrument, and every string is to contribute its quota to the symphony. If the soul is to be the leading singer, then every faculty of our mental, moral, and spiritual being, like a united and harmonious choir, is to render the chorus. No power is to be latent, no voice to be mute. There are notes for all to strike, and all are necessary to an exquisite rendering of the melody.

All that is within me, says the text,—then let it be all. Some of us have a vein of humour, and though we try to keep it under restraint it will peep out. What then? Why, let us make it bear the Lord's yoke. This faculty is not necessarily common or unclean; let it be made a hewer of wood and a drawer of water for the Lord. On the other hand, some of you have a touch of despondency in your nature;

¹ J. A. Hutton, *The Soul's Triumphant Way*, 33.

² M. G. Pearse, *Come, Break your Fast*, 130.

take care to subdue it to the Lord's praise. You are the men to sing those grave melodies which in some respects are the pearls of song. A little pensiveness is good flavouring. The muse is at her best when she is pleasingly melancholy.¹

You heap up coals upon a dying fire and leave it. For a few minutes little flames curl round the outside of the coals, and for a short time there is a lively stir. But soon those little flames die out. The fire becomes quiet and still. The only sound is one for which you have to listen, and even then it is heard only at intervals. It is the sound of a general sinking—the heavy and unkindled coals weighing down and crushing the inner heart of fire. When you come back, if you have not been absent too long, you find your fire dozing, as it were, in sleep. If you have been absent a very long time, when you come back you find your fire gone out. Sometimes you think it quite out when it is only sleeping; sometimes you think it is only sleeping when it is quite gone out. And that is true both of the fire on our hearths and of the fire of God in human hearts. You cannot say whether there is yet life at the centre, or whether the sleep has been 'unto death,' until you pierce to the *centre* and appeal to it to give some sign. But if you return in time to catch your drowsy fire still in life, though giving merely the evidence of smoke, what will you do to bring it back to life? You will do what the Psalmist appeals to his soul to do for itself; you will stir up all that is within it. You will thrust the iron into the heart of it and break up the crust which was slowly crushing it to death. It seems an extraordinary thing that a fire can die not for want of fuel, but through its abundance of fuel. It may seem extraordinary that a man's religion may die out, not because he has not sufficient religious knowledge and religious facts, and even religious practices, but because he has too much or too many of them; or rather, because they are *unkindled*, because the central fire, the man's true need of God, is not penetrating and kindling all his religious knowledge and all his religious practices.²

5. '*His holy name.*'—If we are to worship and praise God aright, we must believe in a God whose name is a veritable gospel of gladness to our souls. We must believe in a God whose character is fitted to inspire devout thought and excite religious feelings of reverence, trust, gratitude, and admiration. How great and glorious is the God this Psalmist worships; how easy it is to be enthusiastic in His praise. He is a beneficent Being. He delights to bestow penitence, forgive sin, heal disease, to save life, to crown His worshippers with garlands of love and mercy, and make their hearts young with gladness. He is a righteous God, who espouses the cause of the oppressed and shields them from wrong; a magnanimous God, who bears patiently with our shortcomings; a God with a father's heart, full of pity towards frail man subject to infirmity and pain. He is mighty as well

¹ C. H. Spurgeon.

² J. A. Hutton.

as merciful, sitting in majesty on a heavenly throne and ruling as King over all, receiving perfect obedience from the manifold powers of the universe which do His will and show forth His glory. How can the worshippers of such a God help blessing Him! They must needs serve this God 'with gladness and come before His presence with singing; for He is good, His mercy is everlasting, and His truth endureth to all generations.'

And He is *holy*. A babe in grace can bless God for His goodness, but only a grown believer will bless God for His holiness. We bless God for His mercy, but do we equally bless Him for His holiness? we praise Him for His bounty, but do we feel that we could not praise Him thus unless we knew also that He is perfectly righteous?

II.

RECOLLECTION.

'And forget not all his benefits.'

1. One of the most frequent causes of our failure to have the spirit of praise is forgetfulness of past benefits. When we come to the end of a day's journey and sit down to enter into its experiences, how readily do we record the disagreeable things—the disappointments, the vexations, the crosses that have been met with. All that has not been as we should like is carefully entered, and as we sit there and turn over the pages of the book we find entries similar to the one we have just made—records of trials and disappointments and hardships—and when we read them it seems as if there were no other soul in the wide world whose lot could be so cheerless and desolate as ours. We have no song of praise, for there is no melody in our heart; we cannot say, 'Bless the Lord, O my soul,' for we feel that for us there is no special reason for thanksgiving. We have forgotten to make notes of the benefits.

'Think and Thank' was the motto on the family crest of Sir Moses Montefiore, the lamented philanthropist. Indeed the two words, differing only in one vowel, have the same derivation. In the old Anglo-Saxon, 'thankfulness' means 'thinkfulness'; the thinking, recalling, remembering of our blessings in such a way as to be moved to gratitude. It is our duty to remember. We cannot remember all His benefits, but we certainly ought not to forget them all. It is because we are not more thankful that we are not more thankful. If we think we cannot but thank.

2. There are some people who pride themselves on never forgetting an injury. It is surely a very

poor thing to pride oneself upon. There are multitudes who should humble themselves because they never remember a kindness—especially a kindness bestowed on them by a loving and bountiful God. ‘The river past, and God forgotten,’ is a proverb which reminds us how much readier we are to ask good at God’s hand, and to implore help from Him in seasons of extremity and distress, than to pause afterwards to give Him thanks. You remember how, when Jesus had healed the ten lepers who besought His mercy, nine out of the ten straightway forgot all about their obligation to Him. And it was with a reproachful sadness in His tone that Jesus exclaimed, ‘Were there not ten cleansed, but where are the nine? There are not found that returned to give glory to God, save this stranger.’

The word ‘benefit’ is in itself a grand word. It means ‘good deed.’ Now, I like a man who has good will—*bene volens*—a man who on a dark night says, ‘Good-night, I wish you well.’ ‘Good-night, friend,’ I say; ‘I thank you.’ That is *bene volens*. But I like better the man who says, ‘Stop a bit; it is a dark moor over there; I will get a lantern; I know my way, and I can take you across this footpath, which will be a short-cut, and see you safely into the high road.’ He shakes me by the hand and says, ‘Good-night.’ That is *bene volens* turned into *bene fit*. *Bene fit* is good deed. *Bene volens* is good; but *bene fit* is better. Oh, our God loves us never with good will only.¹

3. God’s word ever clothes itself in truth and in deed. His benefits are substantial. Yet of forgetting them we all are guilty. David made no mistake. He knew the temptation to forget, and we know it still. Why are we all so ready to forget all His benefits?

(1) Because we are *so accustomed to them*. Some one has said that if all the stars in heaven were to cease shining for a hundred years, and then were suddenly to flash out again, there would not be an eye in all the earth but would be raised heavenward, and not a heart in all the world but would break forth in hymns of praise to God. But the stars are shining every night. They were there when we were crooning in our cradles. They will be there when we are sleeping in our graves. And we are so accustomed to them that we never lift our heads, but fret and worry every night perhaps, forgetful of these shining remembrancers of God. So with God’s benefits. Did they come rarely, singly, unexpectedly, how we should prize them. But they have been over

us like the heavens, round us like the air, under us like the earth, ever since we were born. And we are so accustomed to them that our hearts are hardened.

(2) Because they are *so freely given*. The old proverb ‘lightly come, lightly go’ is true, as in a rough way proverbs generally are. What we get easily, we do not value greatly. God gives His benefits freely, royally. And because they are so freely given, we are ever ready to make light of them. Was it by years of toil that our eyes acquired their marvellous power of seeing? Was it by the sweat of the brow that our ears were trained to hear? Was it the labour of our hands that fashioned the chambers of our thought, and built the galleries of our imagination? Not so. God gave these gifts with royal grace. And since they are so freely given, we hold them lightly and forget them.

Here is a lad living at home. He pays no board or lodging. Look how he spoils his clothes and quarrels with his food. How carelessly and thanklessly he wears the one and eats the other! But wait till he leaves home and goes to fight the world. See him in his lodgings. Ah! what a change has come over him. He is no longer careless of his clothes. He sits down to his food with a new relish. What has made all the difference? Why, this. He earns both food and clothing now with the sweat of his own brow. Once they were freely given, and he despised them. But now he wins them by his work, and so he knows their value.²

(3) Because they are often *disguised*. Earth speaks one language; heaven speaks another; and many a happening that in the speech of earth is called a curse, in the speech of heaven is called a blessing. God clothes His ministering angels in strange garments. And if we have failed to see the shining angel, it is because we could not pierce that strange disguise. In one of the old fairy tales there is a magic wand that touches the wizard dwarf and he becomes a prince. There is a wand like that for us. God calls it faith. And when we wield it, and touch with it the hardest and bitterest things that seem to dwarf us, they often change and become regal helps. We thought them blackest, and now we see them brightest.

I daresay that you have all noticed this, that in seeing scenery—like that, for instance, in Switzerland—one great secret is often to look back. You may be ascending an Alpine path, with great walls of mountain on either side shutting out the view, and in front of you all day there may be nothing but a snowclad, towering height; but after you have ascended for some time turn round and look back, and

¹ Mark Guy Pearse.

² G. H. Morrison.

probably you will find that you can see over the tops of the mountains which have been shutting out the view to great valleys beyond, while round the horizon the mountains are glowing in the sunset. Now in life also it is a great secret often to look back; and it will frequently be found that those passages that appeared the dullest and darkest as we passed through them are in the retrospect glowing in the light of God.¹

4. How shall we get better memories for all God's benefits?

(1) Let us *number* His benefits, as David did. A general thankfulness never praises God. We must get to it benefit by benefit if we want to know what we owe God. David knew that. David did that. And never was there a man who better knew than noble David how to confess sin and how to remember benefits. He cried to his soul, 'Forget not all his benefits.' Then he began to number them.

I was walking along one winter's night, hurrying towards home, with my little maiden by my side. Said she, 'Father, I am going to count the stars.' 'Very well,' I said, 'Go on.' By-and-by I heard her counting—'Two hundred and twenty-three, two hundred and twenty-four, two hundred and twenty-five. Oh dear!' she said, 'I had no idea there were so many.' Ah! dear friends, I sometimes say in my soul, 'Now, Master, I am going to count Thy benefits.' I am like the little maiden. Soon my heart sighs—sighs not with sorrow, but burdened with such goodness—and I say within myself, 'Ah! I had no idea there were so many.'²

(2) Let us *measure* them. And let us be careful *how* we measure them, for if we measure them aright, we can make molehills into mountains, but if we measure them wrongly we can make mountains into molehills. All depends on how we measure them.

We are very apt to measure out benefits by our *desires*, and the result is always disastrous. Our desires are made to hold God, and what is big enough to hold God cannot be filled with anything less. We might fling into a man's desire a million worlds, and the man should yet perish of hunger. 'What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world?' Why, he is too big for the world; we cannot fill him up with worlds. A universe without God could not satisfy him; his desires are made to hold the infinite.

We are apt to measure our benefits by *those of other people*. Some of us are always reckoning up the blessings which other people have received, and reckoning up our own miseries. We look at ourselves from picturesque points of view and

take a strange kind of pleasure in the thought that we are exceptionally miserable. It is an unhealthy state of mind, and it is productive of misery to ourselves and of unhappiness to other people. We cannot measure our mercies by other people's. God fits men's packs to their backs, and our backs will not suit other people's packs.

The only true way to measure our benefits is by *our deserts*. Then is every molehill a very mountain of mercy. Saadi, the Persian poet, informs us that he never complained of his condition but once—when his feet were bare, and he had no money to buy shoes; but meeting with a man without *feet*, he instantly became contented with his lot and thankful for his mercies. When we measure our mercies by our deserts, we are lost in wonder, love, and praise.

(3) Let us strive to *recognize* God's benefits, to see His hand in everything that befalls us. We need prayerful hearts and open eyes that we may be quick to detect God in all around us. Then we shall love Him for His exceeding mercy, and if we love Him we shall remember Him, and thank and praise Him.

Thomas Boston lived some hundred years ago, and was one of those faithful ministers whom God gives from time to time as His best gifts to Scotland. And when you come to read the Memoirs of Thomas Boston I know what will arrest you first. It will be this. Whatever befell Boston, you are sure to find him on his knees asking God to reveal to him the meaning of the providence. Did his wife sicken, did his child die, was he detained from a Sacrament by snowstorms, did his horse cast a shoe, you will have Thomas Boston asking God to let him see the meaning of it. And very often God was pleased to do it; till Boston grew to feel that in God he lived and moved and had his being, and that God was doing all things well; and till, instead of murmuring and fretting, he came to have a heart so full of praise and thankfulness and humble resignation, that the fragrance of it breathes through Scotland yet.³

I thought, on first reading the great simple words of the Great Text for September, that it would not be easy to light upon a satisfactory illustration of them, and yet that very day I came upon one in a rough-looking, hard-working, woman friend. This woman, on the death of the mother of a large family, to whom she was in no way related but whom as an orphan she had brought up, took the family, and brought them up also in the kindest and most careful manner. After a few years she went to a district town with them where she thought they might have a better chance of getting on. That going-away happened seven years ago, and a fortnight ago she returned to the house she left, having with her two of the daughters of the large family—one of them in a

¹ J. Stalker.

² Mark Guy Pearse.

³ G. H. Morrison.

helplessly delicate state of health. One day last week, in my afternoon visits, I came upon the delicate one sitting on the topmost of six stone steps leading into their very humble dwelling, and as I was kindly inquiring for her and for them all, my rough-looking friend, hearing my voice, came out from the kitchen with linen cloths wrapped about her face; for she has been suffering for some considerable time from cancer which already has made sad and sore inroads on the honest countenance. 'And how are you keeping?' I asked;

and then she replied with a smile, and a touch of hopefulness, 'Thank God, sir, I feel no worse, but I think rather better, and I have much to be thankful for, very much; God has been good to me and merciful, and I cannot be too thankful.' As I came away she said in the most graceful way, 'I'll be glad to see you at any time.' And this is a woman who never got charity, and who does not beg or look for charity even yet.¹

¹ Donald M. Henry, Whithorn.

Codex Edinburgensis.

A HITHERTO UNKNOWN MANUSCRIPT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By PROFESSOR THE REV. A. R. S. KENNEDY, D.D., UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

III.

THE Edinburgh Codex, then, is simply an additional witness to the scrupulous care with which the text approved by the Massoretes has been transmitted from age to age. At the same time it presents innumerable variations, each of little account in itself, but in the mass sufficient to give the MS. an individuality of its own. The nature and extent of these variations could be adequately shown only by the collation of a number of typical passages from the several divisions of the Canon. To attempt such a collation within the present limits is out of the question. This description of the Codex Edinburgensis, however, would be incomplete without some more precise indication than has yet been given of the variations referred to. I propose, therefore, to collate the two passages (2 K. 25^{27b-30}, Jer 1¹⁻²²) contained in the page of the MS. reproduced as the frontispiece to the June number of this magazine. The student will thus be able to check my results for himself. The standard of comparison will naturally be the printed texts of Baer and Ginsburg, which claim to reproduce 'accuratissime' the text 'according to the Massorah.'

COLLATION OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT OF A PAGE OF CODEx EDINBURGENSIS, WITH EXPLANATORY NOTES.¹

A. 2 K 25^{27b-30}.

Codex Edinburgensis. Baer and Ginsburg.

Col. a	4	יְהוֹכָן ^a	יְהוֹכָן
"	"	9	בְּבָלָה ^b
"	"	15	חִיּוֹ ^c B. חִיּוֹ; G. חִיּוֹ

¹ No account is taken of the differences in the divisions of the text, or of the more minute variations in the accentuation.

B. JER 1¹⁻²².

Codex Edinburgensis. Baer and Ginsburg.

Col. a	32	עֲשֵׂתִי עֲשֵׂרָה ^d	עֲשֵׂתִי-עֲשֵׂרָה
"	b	2	הַחֲמִשִּׁי ^e
"	"	4	אֶצְרֵךְ ^f (B. אֶצְרֵי)
"	"	8	אֶהָה אֶרְנִי יְהוָה ^g
"	"	12	כִּי עַל כָּל-אִשֶּׁר ^h
"	"	13	אֶשְׁלַחְךָ ⁱ
"	"	27	רֹאֶה ^k
"	"	31	לְעִשְׂתּוֹ ^l
"	"	32	אֵלַי, an omission supplied by the corrector
"	"	34	נָפַח ^m corrected to נָפְתָה
"	c	14	לְמַעַשֵׂי ⁿ Baer as Cod. Ed., but with metheg; G. Kéth. as Cod. Ed., but Qêrê לְמַעַשֵׂה
"	"	15	תִּאָזֹר ^o B. תִּאָזֹר; G. תִּאָזֹר
"	"	16	אֱלֹהִים ^p
"	"	18	מִצִּוָּךְ ^q
"	"	21	מִבְּצֵר ^r
"	"	26	וְלֹא יִבְלַדְךָ ^s G. וְלֹא-יִבְלֹךְ
"	"	27	נָאִם יְהוָה (with maqqeph)
"	"	29	הָלֹךְ ^t B. הָלָךְ; G. הָלֹךְ
"	"	34	בַּמִּדְבָּר, an omission supplied by the corrector.

(a) 2 K 25²⁷. The absence of the metheg is characteristic of Codex Edinburgensis as of other early MSS., see above, p. 438d. Cf. וארחו, a 12, which in the current texts has two methegs, וּבְעִנְתּוֹ and וּבְעִנְתּוֹ, a 23, in modern editions "חָק", "חָק"—and so throughout. Note also on the photograph the position of the points of the preceding word, which in Baer appears as אֲחִידָשׁ, in Ginsburg as אֲחִידָשׁ.

(*δ*) v.²⁸. This is an interesting variant typical of hundreds of similar cases in which the MS. followed by the punctuator or the Massoretic annotator had a different reading from the codex copied by the original scribe of Codex Edinburgensis. Here the latter had the more common form with *ḥ locale*, כְּדָלָה, but the former read כְּדָלָל, and the *consonantal text was corrected accordingly*. The minute *ḥ* (=8)¹ in the margin is from the pen of the Massorete, and tells us that this is one of eight passages where the Massorah requires the reading כְּדָלָל. In the Massorah magna in the lower margin of the page—so called to distinguish it from the Massorah parva between the columns—the eight passages² are adduced in the usual manner by the citation of one or more catchwords for each of the verses in question. As a specimen of the Greater Massorah the note may here be translated in full. 'כְּדָלָל [is found] eight times [in O.T.], and its "sign" (סִמָּן, σημειών = "the references are") : "and he spake kindly to him" [2 K 25²⁸], and its neighbour (*i.e.* the parallel passage, Jer 52³²); "he shall perform his pleasure on Babylon" [Is 48¹⁴]; "and of them shall be taken up a curse" [Jer 29²²]; "and I will execute upon Bel in Babylon" [Jer 51⁴⁴]; "now, therefore, if it seem good to the king" [Ezr 5¹⁷]; "then Darius" [Ezr 6¹].'

The Lesser Massorah has also a note on the following word וְשֵׁנָה, viz. בְּ אֵת הָ, which means '[this word occurs] twice, but once it is written with ḥ, referring to וְשֵׁנָה in the parallel passage, Jer 52³²'. Note, also, in passing the position of the diacritical point of Shin and Sin in Codex Edinburgensis, in particular the fact that this point is not merged in the point of cholem as in our printed texts. See, *e.g.*, בשלש, a 28, שָׁקַד, b 30, לְעִשְׂתּוֹ, b 31, etc.

(*c*) v.³⁰. Ginsburg here agrees with Codex Edinburgensis in reading חִי without an alternative; Baer gives חִי as the true Massoretic text with חִי as the Qērē, see his *Liber Regum*, p. 119.

The Massoretic note appended to the Book of Kings, giving the number of its verses as 1935, will be discussed at a later stage. Then follows the illuminated Latin title 'Jeremias C. i.' On the margin a later hand has inserted the word תְּפִיכָה, indicating that one of the Haphtarahs, or lessons from the Prophets, begins with Jer 1¹ (see Ginsburg,³ *in loc.*).

(*d*) Jer 1³. For a list of MSS. with this minor variant of וְשֵׁנָה without maqqeph, and with the accent munach, see Ginsburg. Other instances of the omission of maqqeph in Codex Edinb. will be found b 9, 12; cf. note *r* below.

(*e*) v.³. *Scriptio defectiva* and without metheg—one of thousands of similar variations in the presence or absence of the vowel-letters (*matres lectionis*) Yod and Waw. A minute Yod has been added above the line. Cf. notes *f*, *l*, *n*, *o*, *s*

below. Other variants of this class are אֹתָם, c 11, עֹבֹנִי, c 12, which may be entered here.

(*f*) v.⁵. Another case of variant vocalization. The original scribe wrote the word *without* the vowel-letter, which appears in the *text* of B and G with the Massoretic note that 'ו is superfluous.' This is one of hundreds of cases where it is clear that the codex whose readings are represented by the *vocalization* of Codex Edinburgensis, and that from which the consonantal text was copied, represent two slightly divergent Massoretic traditions. Here, for example, the scribe's MS. had *the correct text without Waw*; the punctuator's MS. had the incorrect text *with* Waw and, in addition, the marginal note, 'לֹא קֵו' (the ו is not to be read, *i.e.* the correct reading is אֲמִירָךְ). Hence the curious result that the punctuator or annotator added the intrusive ו above the line in order to give a reason for the marginal note. In other words, a correct reading was changed into a wrong one, simply for the sake of correcting it! An illuminating commentary in the boasted uniformity of the Massorah!

(*g*) v.⁶. Note (1) the position of mappiq אֶהְיֶה, and (2) the omission of the cholem-point in אֶרֶץ, and (3) the pointing of the tetragrammaton, for which see above, p. 438*δ*.

(*h*) v.⁷. עַל with metheg and without maqqeph, for which see Ginsburg's list of MSS.

(*i*) The irregular pathach under Lamed is probably due to a slip of the punctuator, — for —. Note, again, the absence of the two methegs.

(*k*) v.¹¹. Note the deletion of the vowel-letter by the punctuator (cf. note *f*). Conversely the Waw is inserted by him in וְהָקָם, b 34.

(*l*) v.¹². Once more the redundant Waw is here deleted to accord with the Massorah (see margin), which tells us that this form וְעִשְׂתּוֹ occurs five times in O.T., and each time it is written *defective* (תְּקַרָּה).

(*m*) v.¹⁶. According to the Lesser Massorah (יֵא כֹהֵן, *i.e.* [מַעֲשֵׂי] is written eleven times with ו) the construct *plural* is here the correct form; see Ginsburg for the readings of the MSS., Baer, *Liber Jerem.*, p. 83, for the Massorah, also Kittel *in loc.*

(*n*) v.¹⁷. For the four or five different ways in which this word is pointed in the MSS., see Ginsburg and Baer.

(*o*) According to Baer (p. 83), 'אֵלֵיהֶם' ubique in lib. Jerem. plene cum Jod.⁴

(*p*) This is the only real variant from the recognized Massorah allowed to remain on this page of our Codex, for the correction in the margin (אֶחָד) is of a later date than the Codex itself. Although our reading with *ḥ* does not seem to be found in the MSS. collated by Ginsburg, it is found in fourteen other MSS. according to Rothstein (*apud* Kittel), for which see de Rossi's list (*Var. Lect. Vet. Test. in loc.*).

(*q*) v.¹⁸. The pathach is doubtless to be explained as in note *i*.

(*r*) v.¹⁹. In its treatment of these words—וְלֹא with munach, and maqqeph joining the second and third words—Codex Edinburgensis has the correct form according to Baer (*op. cit.*, p. 83), as against Ginsburg's alternative, whom see, as before, for the MS. evidence.

(*s*) 2^d. Here again, as so often, our two leading authorities on the Massorah are at variance. According to Baer, 'קִלְרִי sine Vav in codd. veteribusque edd.'—a dictum which now

¹ The point which appears above so many of the letters in the margins is the sign of a contraction, or denotes, as in this case, that the letter is used numerically.

² In reality only *seven* passages are cited, the eighth, 2 Ch 36⁷, having been inadvertently omitted.

³ The references to Ginsburg in the sequel are to his text of Jeremiah (1910), forming part of the new edition of his 'Massoretico-critical' Hebrew Bible which he is preparing for the British and Foreign Bible Society.

requires modification in the light of the reading of Codex Edinburgensis. Note, finally, the position of the shewa of אָהַרִי in אָהַרִי immediately preceding compared with the normal form in אָהַרִי in the line above (cf. p. 438b).

This part of my paper may perhaps fitly close with the reflexion that of all the fairly numerous variants presented by this page of our Codex there is not a single instance in which the meaning of the text is in any way affected, not even by the most outstanding various reading in Jer 1¹⁷ (מִצֹּה).

The space at my disposal prevents me from entering at any length into the value of the great amount of Massoretic material contained in the ample margins of the pages of Codex Edinburgensis, even were I more competent than I claim to be to act as pilot on this almost uncharted sea. My readers must be content meanwhile with the few specimens of the Massorah, both lesser and greater, given in the preceding notes. There is one section of the Massorah, however, to which I should like to refer in a few sentences, namely, the notes at the close of most of the O.T. books giving the number of the verses and of the sections, the middle verse, and other details.

It is well known that the MSS. differ to some extent in the numbers contained in these closing summaries (see esp. Ginsburg, *Introduction*, etc., pp. 68-108). In this respect the Edinburgh MS. also goes its own way. Thus in the Massoretic summary at the close of Kings (see the frontispiece to the June number) we read: 'The sum of the verses of the Book of Kings is a thousand and nine hundred and thirty and five' (1935). This is clearly a mistake for 1535. But the only other MS. known to give this number is the famous St. Petersburg Codex of the year 916. All the others previously known have 1534. Strangely enough both figures are wrong, the real number of verses being 1536 (see Ginsburg, *op. cit.*, p. 90; Baer, *Lib. Regum*, p. 119).

In the case of the three prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, also, our Codex has some remarkable figures. The number for Isaiah is 1273 (אַלֶּהֶם), which is very near the 1272 of the St. Petersburg Codex, but the great majority of MSS. have 1291, the true number according to the present verse-division. For Jeremiah our Codex gives $\text{אַשְׁמֹנֶה} = 1349$, where, however, מ is probably a slip for ס , which would give us 1369. The majority of MSS. have 1365, the St. Petersburg

MS. alone having 1364, which is the correct number. The number for Ezekiel, 1235 (אַרְלֵהֶם), diverges still further from that found in other MSS. which vary between 1273 and 1274 (see for the whole subject, in addition to Ginsburg, *op. cit.*, L. Blau, 'Massoretic Studies,' iv., in *J.Q.R.*, ix [1897], pp. 477-490).

The middle verse, or the verse beginning the second half, of each book is duly noted by the marginal entry חֲצִי הַסֵּפֶר . Under this head, also, our Codex has its own peculiarities. In the margin opposite Gn 48⁵, I find the less usual entry $\text{רְבִיעִית שֶׁל הוֹרָה}$, 'the fourth part of the Torah.' As in other MSS. there are three different reckonings of the half of the Torah or Pentateuch. If we count by verses, the middle verse (of 5845 verses) is Lev 8⁸; if by words, the middle falls within Lev 10¹⁶, more precisely between the words דָּרַש and דָּרַשׁ , or as it is expressed in the margin, דָּרַשׁ , *i.e.* דָּרַשׁ belongs to one half of the Torah, and דָּרַשׁ to the other. When the letters of the Torah are counted, finally, the middle letter, according to our Codex and the Massorah, is the ו of נָחַק in Lev 11⁴² (cf. p. 438a above).

In conclusion I wish briefly to supplement the statements in my first paper regarding the condition and history of the Codex. Although it is now bound in two volumes, the second containing the books from Joshua onwards (see p. 391), I think it is quite evident that the latter volume now includes what originally formed two volumes, making three in all. The main ground on which this conclusion is based is the gruesome fact that several folios of Joshua at the beginning, and of the close of Isaiah in the middle, of vol. ii. must at one time have lain soaked in human blood.¹ The only explanation that suggests itself of the bloodstains *in the middle of the volume* is that the original second volume ended with Isaiah. This is confirmed by the presence of חֹזֶק , 'be of good courage,' from the pen of the scribe at the end of Deuteronomy, of Isaiah, and of Chronicles (see p. 437b), that is, at the end of each of the three original volumes, and there only.

These blood-stained pages, further, afford a significant hint as to the past history of our manuscript, suggesting that, like many another of

¹ I am indebted to my colleague, Professor Harvey Littlejohn, for the pains he has taken in verifying the above by means of a reagent and otherwise.

our extant MSS. (see *e.g.* Ginsburg, *Introduction*, 777 f.), it probably came into Christian hands on the occasion of one of the all too numerous persecutions of 'the tribes of the wandering foot' that disgrace the history of mediæval Europe.

ERRATUM, p. 525a. In the reference to G.-K. *Grammar*, § 8 f., 'not' has been erroneously inserted by the proof-reader! The sentence should run, 'we ought to write נא but נאם.' That is, when נ has no vowel of its own it may bear the point of Cholem, but not otherwise.

Literature.

DESTITUTION.

WHILE the Insurance Bill is pursuing its perilous way through the House of Commons let us read *The Prevention of Destitution*, by Sidney and Beatrice Webb (Longmans; 6s. net). It is true that Insurance is the subject of only one chapter of the book, but it is a long chapter and central. Nothing we are likely to come across in our reading will prepare us better for understanding the need for legislation on Insurance, or give us a better conception of the kind of legislation that is needed. Here, for instance, is a paragraph that seems to go to the heart of the matter:

'We attribute the failure of both the voluntary sickness insurance of England, and the compulsory sickness insurance of Germany, to instigate and promote any really effective campaign for the prevention of sickness, to their common divorce from the Public Health administration of their respective countries. Owing to their organization on an entirely different basis of membership than that of the Public Health area, the Sickness Insurance Funds of Germany are, in fact, as little connected with what we should term the Public Health Service as are the Friendly Societies of our own country. The managing committees, in both cases, have their minds set on relief, not prevention; in both cases they are powerless themselves to undertake the campaign necessary to do for phthisis what has been so successfully done for typhus; in both cases the cost of such a campaign would fall upon one set of shoulders, whilst the direct pecuniary benefits would fall upon a different set. So far as our own country is concerned, we suggest that the only practical chance of turning to account, as an incentive and a help to the actual prevention of sickness, the

vast expenditure and extensive organization involved in universal and compulsory sickness insurance, would be to associate it very closely with the existing Public Health Service. We see no way in which the community can actually prevent malingering, except by bringing to bear the resources of the Public Health administration. The Local Health Authority is already definitely charged with the prevention of disease, and it has, in its medical and sanitary staff, its 700 municipal hospitals, and its organization of Health Visiting and Sanitary Inspection, the nucleus of a service concentrated entirely on preventive methods, and already treating successfully more than a hundred thousand patients a year. The Medical Officers of Health have been taught by long experience in their work in preventing epidemics, to search out disease in its incipient stage; to offer hospital treatment when the conditions of the home do not admit of quick recovery; by changes in the environment, to alter, where necessary, the permanent conditions of the patient's life, and to insist on hygienic conduct so as to prevent the occurrence or recurrence of the disease. If the administration of Sick Benefit were intimately associated with this work of prevention, a National Insurance Scheme might not merely be safeguarded from fraudulent claims, but might become a potent instrument for diminishing the sickness-rate.'

The other topics dealt with are these: (1) Destitution as a Disease of Society; (2) How to Prevent the Destitution that arises from Sickness; (3) Destitution and Eugenics; (4) How to Prevent the Destitution arising from Child Neglect; (5) Sweating and Unemployment as Causes of Destitution; (6) How to Prevent Unemployment and Under-Employment; (7) The Enlarged Sphere of Voluntary Agencies in the Prevention of Destitu-

tion; (8) The Need for a Common Register and a Register of Public Assistance; (9) The 'Moral Factor.'

The last chapter is at once the most searching and the most difficult. It touches two interests—the interest of the 'unworkable' and the interest of the easy philanthropist. On the one hand, how is the incorrigibly lazy to be brought to a sense of the claim which society makes upon him? On the other hand, how is the merely emotional element to be eliminated from the privilege of giving? 'We assert,' say these experienced philanthropists, 'that the mere relief of destitution, whether by State action or Voluntary Agencies, with all its demoralizing effect on personal character, and its inevitable palliation and encouragement of "moral failure"—however necessary to our conscience such relief may have been in the seventeenth, the eighteenth, or the nineteenth century—can now be dispensed with, without suffering and without inhumanity. The advance of knowledge, and, in the United Kingdom, the growth in national and municipal organization, now for the first time permit us to substitute, for all kinds of mere "relief," measures of prevention of the several causes of destitution, and measures of treatment of every case not prevented, which, whilst ensuring that no person whatever goes unprovided for, can be demonstrated to be without injurious effect on personal character or national energy.'

FREE CHRISTIANITY.

Some of the papers read at the Fifth International Congress of Free Christianity and Religious Progress have already been noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. For they have already been issued separately. Now they are all gathered into one handsome volume which Messrs. Williams & Norgate have published at the price of 8s. 6d. net in paper, and 9s. 6d. net in cloth. The title is: *Fifth International Congress of Free Christianity and Religious Progress*, Berlin, August 5-10, 1910. Edited by Charles W. Wendte, D.D., with the assistance of V. D. Davis, B.A.

It is only in the collected volume that one can see what the Congress stands for. In a word, every subject that belongs to Christianity is taken within its scope. But every subject is treated from the scientific, that is, the outwardly demon-

strable, point of view. There were no mystics at the Congress. There were no evangelicals.

Stay a moment. That does not mean that all the speakers were materialists. Mysticism is not used in opposition to materialism. In fact, there was no materialist present. Nor does it mean that none of the speakers gloried in the gospel. They all gloried in it. But every man who spoke understood that he spoke as a 'free' in opposition to an 'evangelical' Christian; and every speaker spoke as a 'progressive' in opposition to an 'illuminative' Christian.

What does it all come to? It comes to this, that mystical Christianity must be shown to be progressive, that is, truly scientific, Christianity; and evangelical Christianity must be shown to be truly free. As long as the mystic denies the place of the historical fact, and as long as the evangelical denies the right of historical criticism, there will be occasion and great need for protests like those made at the Fifth Congress of Free Christianity and Religious Progress.

The American Baptist Publication Society of Philadelphia is issuing a series of pamphlets for the Social Service Commission of the Northern Baptist Convention, under the editorship of Professor Shailer Mathews. Two pamphlets already published are *Welfare Work by Corporations* by Mary Lathrop Goss, and *International Justice* by Professor G. C. Wilson (10 cents net each).

Happy will the booklover be who falls in with *Areopagitica* written by Mr. John Milton—with the 'Sydney Humphries' edition, to wit. It is a royal octavo. It is printed in large clear-faced type, on the kind of paper which is usually employed for the finest engravings; and it is bound in parma violet cloth. The publishers are Messrs A. & C. Black, and the price is 10s. net. A 'Special Note' informs us that the whole of the profit derived from the sale of the book will be devoted to the London Library. The first edition is limited to 500 copies; and it is the first edition that will run up in price when these 500 are sold.

We must now be careful, in ordering our Cambridge commentaries, to order them by their proper titles. Hitherto the 'Cambridge Bible for

Schools and Colleges' has used the Authorized Version, and there is another series under the title of 'The Revised Version for the Use of Schools.' To that series two volumes have just been added—*Joshua* (1s. 6d. net), edited by the Rev. P. J. Boyer, M.A., and *James and Hebrews* (1s. 6d. net), edited by the Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A. But now the 'Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges' is itself to use the Revised Version. Two volumes with that version as basis have been issued together—*Exodus* (3s. 6d. net) by Professor Driver, and *Numbers* (2s. 6d. net) by Dr. McNeile.

Professor Driver's *Exodus* is the result of a combination of qualifications for expounding the Old Testament in which he stands alone in our generation and apparently unapproachable. There is a nicety in his knowledge of Hebrew, drawn from familiarity with the Grammar, the use of words, and the genius of the language, which is itself unsurpassed by any living scholar. To that, however, Dr. Driver adds a knowledge of the English Bible, its history and its language, which the ordinary expositor seems to think unnecessary, if not contemptible. Then the whole of the circumstances and surroundings of the writer are mastered—his history, geography, liturgy; the trade, the politics, the family and social life of his time; and his place in the development of Hebrew theology. And to these things is added a command of appropriate expression, especially of felicitous and final translation, which alone would give distinction to an expositor of Scripture. These qualities have never been more fully or more harmoniously displayed than in this commentary on the Book of Exodus.

Dr. McNeile's *Numbers* is shorter. It is too short to let him do himself justice. For he has no mean gift of exposition, even if we cannot place him beside so supreme a master as Dr. Driver. He has almost ignored the language of the English Version, although in our judgment the commentator who uses the Revised Version ought to give more attention to it than the commentator who uses the Authorized Version. All the same, this is excellent scholarly work. Brief as the comments are, the right meaning is usually hit, whatever the word or phrase may be.

In addition to these volumes the Cambridge Press has issued *An Introduction to the Pentateuch* (3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. A. T. Chapman, M.A.

The title is a mistake. It is an Introduction to the Hexateuch. It is of the Hexateuch that Mr. Chapman speaks throughout. How could he do otherwise? And it is a pity that the book comes out under a title which may lead some to think that it is over-conservative and out of date. It is not out of date. There is no hesitation from beginning to end in allowing the scholarship of the last fifty years to reap the whole of its well-earned harvest.

The publications of the University of Chicago Press are now issued in this country by the Cambridge University Press. The latest issue is a substantial and scholarly volume on *The Theology of Schleiermacher*, by Professor George Cross, D.D., of the Newton Theological Institution. The volume is mainly a condensation of Schleiermacher's *Glaubenslehre*. And the condensation is most lucid and masterly. But it is preceded by an historical introduction which contains a sketch of Schleiermacher's life and a history of his relation to earlier Protestantism. It is followed by an estimate of Schleiermacher as a theological influence, and by a most useful bibliography both of Schleiermacher's own works and also of works on Schleiermacher.

We are all proud of the great Oxford English Dictionary, but it is very expensive. We are now offered an Oxford English Dictionary at 3s. 6d. net. And this is the first thing that is remarkable about it—the cost is a record in prices. For it contains 1041 pages, closely printed in double column, and with a free use of costly clarendon type.

The next thing is that it is occupied entirely with the English language as in use. The past is here only to afford derivations.

But that leads to the third remarkable thing. The derivations are on a scale of fulness never seen in a dictionary of this size before. And they are no longer the clever guesses of fertile minds, but strict scientific deduction from the use of the word. Take that curious word *gazebo*. All the dictionaries before the great Oxford explain it as a humorous formation from *gaze*, after 'videbo' from 'video.' But the earliest actual examples seem to be Oriental, and so the humour is not less and the science more. A *gazebo* is described as 'a structure whence a view may be had.'

And this leads to the last notable characteristic. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*

is adapted by H. W. Fowler and F. G. Fowler from the Oxford Dictionary (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press).

'Another Mission has come and gone,' and another volume of addresses by the Bishop of London has been published. There are no addresses like them. Their abandon is amazing; not less amazing is the fertility of their application of the gospel to our daily life. Passing from church to church Dr. Ingram not only delivers these searching addresses, he also invites and answers questions. The title of the book is *Secrets of Strength* (Wells Gardner; 1s. net).

Messrs. Gay & Hancock have changed the title of Mr. F. C. Baker's 'Here and Hereafter' to *Our Immortal Heritage*, and issued a new edition of it (1s. net).

We are not yet out of the wood of weary discussion regarding the claims of *The Historical Jesus and the Theological Christ*. But Principal Estlin Carpenter will help us out. For one thing he believes in the historical Jesus. And for another he shows clearly enough that the theological Christ was bound to differ from the historical Jesus, as every fact must differ from the explanation of it, but that the difference is legitimate and follows the proper lines of historical development. Principal Estlin Carpenter is under no ecclesiastical glamour. His exposition is as individually free as a scientific mind will allow him to make it. And just for that reason he will help us out of the wood. For how reverent he is. And what a sense he has of the majesty of the Historical Jesus; of the might also of the Theological Christ. His book is published by Mr. Philip Green (3s. 6d. net).

Dr. Henry B. Robins, Professor of Systematic Theology in the Pacific Coast Baptist Theological Seminary, has written a book on *Aspects of Authority in the Christian Religion* (Philadelphia: Griffith & Rowland Press; 75 cents net). For he believes that recent criticism has left Catholic and Protestant with the old need of dependence but without a clear understanding of what there is to depend upon. Well, what is there? There is simply Christian experience, says Professor

Robins. But not of the individual alone. 'The individual consciousness must reckon with the collective consciousness of its own times and with the collective consciousness of other times as embodied in confessional utterances, as represented in the New Testament. It may discover in the synthesis those elements which are truly normal, which belong essentially to the Christian life. But the individual experience—and individual experience is the great end of the redemptional process—needs the constant interpretative presence of the Holy Spirit, which always is available for the Christian in his handling of the truth, to enable it to make a proper synthesis and to rise into a normal condition.'

All our religious thinking at present is on religion. At least all that has any freshness in it. Not on theology, not on creeds, not even on liturgiology. We have not passed from these things, but we have been driven by them to think of that on which they rest. We have found it necessary to try to understand what religion is, so as to save ourselves from becoming irreligious. For discussions about Election, about the Athanasian Creed, even about Fasting Communion were like to land us in irreligion. We have been compelled to find a sound basis for them all in the study of religion itself.

And what is religion? Mr. C. Delisle Burns, who has written a book on *Old Creeds and the New Faith* (Griffiths; 6s.), gives us a definition. 'Religion,' he says, 'in the first place is the surrender of self before a reality which is greater, deeper, wider than the self. It is a surrender which is not that made to the family, the state, or even humanity, but to something underlying all these and present also in the individual. Religion, again, is the attempt to express through oneself this underlying force; it involves a feeling of real union in action with this force. Religion thus has a passive and an active element in it.'

And then the rest of the book is an exposition and criticism of the way in which Religion, as thus defined, has been realized in religious communities. There is a chapter on Catholicism, the Religion of all men; on Monasticism, a Spiritual Aristocracy; on Protestantism, the Religion of every Man; on Rational Religion. And as we read we are in touch with a thinker who has not lost the sense of awe.

Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum* is one of the indispensables. It is almost indispensable to the student of any branch of theology; it is quite indispensable to the student of that special branch of theology called Symbolics. And not only so. It is sufficient. Without other books, one may become expert in the study of Symbolics by the use of Denzinger alone. He omits nothing; he mis-states nothing; he misprints nothing. This is the eleventh edition, and it is edited by the Rev. Clemens Bannwart, S.J. A diligent use of an earlier edition leaves one wondering what there was to edit. From the first, Denzinger's *Enchiridion* was the finest laborious German work. The complete title is *Enchiridion Symbolorum Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et Morum* (Herder; 6s.).

An astonishingly cheap book is Dr. Schuster's *Illustrated Bible History* (Herder; 1s. 3d.), and it is no marvel that it has reached its twelfth edition this year. The book has been prepared for the use of Roman Catholic schools, and so its simplicity is its first characteristic. The narrative is retold in short paragraphs with the least possible word of explanation.

The third number of the Publications of the Jews' College in London (the first and second have already been noticed) is *Jefeth b. Ali's Arabic Commentary on Nahum*. The Commentary is given in full in the Hebrew. There are also an introduction, an abridged translation, and notes in English. The editor is Mr. Hartwig Hirschfeld.

The readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES do not require an introduction to Professor Holdsworth of the Handsworth College, nor to his studies on *The Life of Faith* (Kelly). But it is those who read the chapters in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES who will be most eager to buy the book, that the second reading may be consecutive and the more instructive.

But this is not the only book that has been published for Professor Holdsworth this month. He is also the author of the 41st Fernley Lecture, of which the title is *The Christ of the Gospels* (Kelly; 3s. 6d.). What a significant title it is. The previous forty Fernley Lecturers must surely envy Professor Holdsworth his subject. But it is less his choice than his necessity, and in that lies its

significance. For it is the Christ of the Gospels that is the subject of all our hottest discussion. And how wise Professor Holdsworth has been to tell us what the Christ of the Gospels is before he tells us what the multifarious educated and uneducated magazine writers make of Him. If our much worried young men and women would read this sane, scholarly, verifiable picture of the Christ of the Gospels how it would lift up their countenance. Let us do everything in our power to bring it to their knowledge.

It is a wonder that an energetic publisher has not yet been found ready to issue a complete history of Missions. When he comes he must see to it that each division of the work is entrusted to a man who has a thorough knowledge of the land, an unbiassed historical imagination, and a deep well of love to Christ.

For South Africa the man is found already, and the history has been written. The man is the Rev. J. du Plessis, B.A.(Cape), B.D.(Edinburgh); and the book is entitled *A History of Christian Missions in South Africa* (Longmans; 10s. 6d.).

Besides the necessary qualities already named, every one of which Mr. du Plessis possesses in manifest good measure, it is worth observing that he possesses a fine strenuous English style. It is a style that is neither too familiar for historical writing, nor too distant for the things that concern the Kingdom. The volume is a large one, but it may be read from beginning to end with delight; and he who reads it will know the whole story of this 'field.' Not unlikely he will also be led to a deeper interest in the work of Christ abroad.

Another volume has appeared of that most interesting series of books on the native tribes of Assam, edited by Colonel P. R. T. Gurdon. This time the tribe is that of *The Kacháris* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d.), and there is even greater interest than usual in the authorship of it. The author is the late Rev. Sidney Endle, who spent about forty years among this tribe and became their much trusted friend and father. 'When Mr. Endle approached a Kachári village during one of the prolonged preaching tours which were to him at once a duty and the keenest of pleasures, he was always greeted with a joyous and often noisy welcome. He travelled on foot, and the villagers would turn out to see the *gāmi-nī-brai*, the "old

man of the village," as they affectionately called him. He was often cordially invited to share in the village festivities, and it was an interesting sight to watch him seated in the midst of rough semi-savage folk, listening to the tale of their simple joys and sorrows, enjoying their primitive jokes, and, when occasion served, talking to them, as probably no one else will ever be able to talk to them again, of the matters nearest to the missionary's heart.'

These are the words of Mr. J. D. Anderson of the Indian Civil Service, who writes an introduction to the book. Its chief claim on the attention of the student of the Bible is that in the chapter on the Religion of the Kacháris Mr. Endle gives some striking parallels between Kachári and Hebrew custom. The volume is admirably illustrated, some of the illustrations being in colour.

The study of religion is chiefly the cause of the keen interest that is being taken in the study of Psychology. Certainly Psychology is studied apart from religion. But it is not an end. And the keenness of the interest, we say, is due to the fact that the end is Religion and God.

There are many text-books of Psychology pure and simple. There is no easier than *Essentials of Psychology*, by Dr. W. B. Pillsbury, Professor of Psychology in the University of Michigan (Macmillan; 5s. 6d. net). Clearly the book is the result of a teacher's experiments. What after much trial he has found best for his own pupils—to impart the most knowledge and give the most relish for the subject—that he has set down in this well-arranged and well-printed volume.

Mr. J. Kennedy Maclean has written a strong appreciation of Dr. A. T. Pierson by way of introduction to a volume of sermons. The sermons are chosen so as to be representative of Dr. Pierson's message in its fulness and in its strength. But they are chosen from unpublished manuscripts. They certainly show that Dr. Pierson is a preacher. He has a clear ringing gospel message to deliver, and he uses every lawful art to deliver it impressively. In the matter of illustration lies his special attractiveness. He takes great trouble to find his illustrations; he takes great trouble to make sure that they illustrate. The title of the book is *Dr. Pierson and his Message* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d. net).

The new volumes added to the 'Life of Faith Library' are *The Pathway of Victory* by the Rev. Thomas Wilkinson Riddle, and *The Consecrated Life* by the author of *A Father's Letters to his Son* (Marshall Brothers; 1s. net each).

After long and weary neglect four commentaries on Exodus have come out nearly at the same time. First Dr. Bennett's in the Century Bible, next Dr. McNeile's in the Westminster, then Dr. Driver's in the Cambridge Bible, and now Dr. F. B. Meyer's in the Devotional Commentary edited by Mr. Buckland. Dr. Meyer is himself. Scholarship with him is always the obedient handmaid of the Spirit. He cares most of all for the things in Exodus which lead the soul to Jesus (R.T.S.; 2s.).

Messrs. Sands issue the *Notre Dame* series of 'Lives of the Saints.' Two volumes have appeared—*St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland*, and *St. Margaret, Queen of Scotland*. No author's name is given, and there is no claim to originality, whether of research or of characterization. The purpose of the series seems to be to educate in piety the young people who are attached to the Roman Catholic Church. The saints are examples of devout living and Church loyalty.

Two volumes have been published this month of the 'Treasury Library' of Mr. Robert Scott. The Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Beckenham, an enthusiastic and suggestive expositor of the Bible, writes one of them. It has all the freshness of style which we can now count upon from Mr. Lees, and it has the additional interest of being based on the Egyptian papyri. Its title is *Christ and His Slaves* (1s. net). The other is written by the Right Rev. A. E. Joscelyne, D.D., Bishop Coadjutor of Jamaica. Its title is *The Voices of God* (1s. net).

Is there a living man or woman who can construct skeletons more cleverly than the Rev. J. Ellis? His is the famous 'Tool Basket,' a veritable museum of skeleton sermons. And his now is the book called *Sermons in a Nutshell* (Scott).

Under the title of *Twice Born Souls* the Rev. Claud Field, M.A., has written a small volume containing the story of some notable conversions

(Thynne; 1s. net). There is great and refreshing variety; there is also unmistakable and arrestive reality.

Messrs. Williams & Norgate have added to their 'Crown Theological Library' a translation of Professor Harnack's latest work. The title given

to it is *The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels* (5s. net). It is a translation pure and simple, without a word of English introduction. But it is an admirable translation, made by the Rev. J. R. Wilkinson, M.A.; and the readers of Dr. Moffatt's *Introduction* will welcome its appearance at this opportune moment.

Studies in Pauline Vocabulary.

By THE REV. R. MARTIN POPE, M.A., WIMBLEDON.

Of Redeeming the Time.

τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι.—COL. iv. 5.

THE striking phrase above quoted occurs also in Eph 5¹⁶. It is a mark of Pauline style to close a sentence with a pregnant participial clause which lends emphasis and richness to the preceding words. In both passages the phrase is connected with an injunction referring to the Christian's 'walk' or, as we should say, his daily life: but in the Colossian passage the reference to daily life is restricted so as to particularize the Christian's influence on those who are without (πρὸς τοὺς ἔξω), an idea which reminds us of 1 Ti 3⁷, where the Apostle, in discussing the qualifications for the office of bishop, says he 'must have a good report of them who are without' (τῶν ἔξωθεν). The Christian must stand well with unbelievers outside the circle of the Church: he must also ever keep them in view, so far as the influence of his personality is concerned. It should further be noticed that the Ephesian passage, which is more general in its application, adds as a reason for redeeming the time the words 'because the days are evil.'

Now, what does the Apostle mean by redeeming the time or the opportunity? In the first place, it is well to recognize that there is a difference of opinion with regard to the translation of the verb ἐξαγοραζόμενοι. Lightfoot on Col., *loc. cit.*, renders it 'buying up for yourselves'; but Dean Armitage Robinson on Eph., *loc. cit.*, remarks that we have no evidence for regarding the word as equivalent to the Latin *coemo* ('buy up'), and that the general usage of St. Paul (cf. Gal 3¹³ 4⁵) points to the meaning 'buying away from' =

redeeming, but not (he adds) in the sense of making up for lost time, as in the words 'Redeem thy mis-spent time's that past.'¹ The days are evil: the present has got, so to speak, into wrong hands: the Christian must purchase it away from these mis-users. The Vulgate gives us *tempus redimentes*; and we may paraphrase the Apostle's meaning thus—claim the present for the best uses. If the days are evil, that fact only adds point to the nobler use of time. If those who are without are to be won, each moment as it arrives must be employed for the great ends of the kingdom of heaven.

In the second place, we have to establish the meaning of *καιρός*. Doubtless it is more than once used by St. Paul (cf. especially Ro 3²⁶) as practically synonymous with *χρόνος*; but it is a mistake to overlook its proper signification of time in the sense of opportunity or the fitting moment for action; and, indeed, the cases are rare where the context of *καιρός* does not suggest, however faintly, a specific occasion or portion of time. It is the condition of the age ('the days are evil'), or the condition of the unbelieving world, that suggests the present as an opportunity to be purchased without delay and invested in the noblest service.

There is an illuminating passage in Butcher's

¹ The correct and original form of the line in Bishop Ken's famous morning hymn. The variations 'Thy precious time mis-spent redeem' or 'Redeem thy mis-spent moments past' are to be reckoned as examples of the unnecessary and often unjustifiable practice of altering the original wording of hymns. Sometimes the authors, but more frequently hymn-editors, are responsible for the changes.

Harvard Lectures on Greek Subjects (see pp. 117-120), where that brilliant interpreter of the Greek spirit draws out with convincing force, as well as subtle intuition, the distinction between χρόνος and καιρός, time viewed in its extension or succession of moments, and time 'charged with opportunity.' The transformation of *Chronos*, the slow-moving, silent, almost inert teacher, revealer, and agent into *Kairos*, the youthful, keen, determined aggressor, is characteristic of the Hellenic genius. *Chronos* remained on the whole too abstract, too indeterminate, to admit easily of personal embodiment in literature or art. It was otherwise with *Kairos*, a word which I believe has no single or precise equivalent in any other language. *Kairos* is that immediate present which is what we make it: Time charged with opportunity, our own possession to be seized and vitalized by human energy, momentous, effectual, decisive; Time, the inert, transformed into purposeful activity.'

All this is borne out, as Butcher proceeds to show, by the representation of *Kairos* in art and literature. Ion composed a hymn on *Kairos*, in which he is called the youngest child of Zeus: opportunity being conceived of as the latest and God-given gift. In art he is represented in the guise of Hermes, as wrestler or charioteer, swift but sure in decision. 'Sometimes he is a youth pressing forward with wings on his feet and back, holding a pair of scales, which he inclines with a slight touch of the right hand to one side. His hair is long in front and bald behind: he must be grasped, if at all, by the forelock.' In one relief he is contrasted with Regret (μετάνοιά), 'who is a shrinking and dejected form, standing beside an old man symbolizing the sadness felt over the last moments which cannot be recalled.'

It is not surprising that the conception of καιρός, which thus possessed the Hellenic imagination, should have passed over into the language and thought of Christianity. In the Wisdom Literature of the O.T., which is the outcome of the contact of Hebraism with Hellenism, the idea of the right time for action, as dictated by motives of common sense or expediency, or revealed by observation and experience of life, is frequently expressed. 'To everything there is a season' (Ec 3¹). On this passage Dr. Moffatt (*Literary Illustrations of the Bible*) quotes Thomas Fuller: 'He is a good time-server that finds out the fittest opportunity for every action. God hath made a time for every-

thing under the sun, save only for that which we do at all times—to wit, sin.' And this comment reminds us that the Christian view of life is characterized by a spiritual urgency which never appears in the literature of wisdom or philosophy. Indeed, there is a silent and subtle transformation of the old conceptions and language in the Christian environment, whereby we become conscious of entrance into a new order of thought. From the Christian standpoint life is not less purposive and active than in the Hebraic and Hellenic philosophies; but it is transfigured by new motives and ideals connected with the unseen. The doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood sanctifies human responsibility; it carries with it an ethical ideal, 'We must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day' (Jn 9⁴); the works of the Father—grace, compassion, love—these are impressed on His children as a divine duty.

Hence *Kairos*, interpreted in the light of the mind of Christ, looks less at self and more at humanity. Its watchword is not so much success as salvation. The Cross, as Matthew Arnold pointed out (*St. Paul and Protestantism*, p. 75), is not an appeasement of God's wrath, but a death 'to the law of selfish impulse,' which had corrupted the heart of mankind. Jesus suffered not for His good but for ours: His death was a μαρτύριον, a witness to self-effacing love: it was also an ἀντίλυτρον, a ransom in respect of our need.

We have yet to proceed on the spirit and virtue of the Cross. 'The days are evil' because the Spirit of the Crucified, who suffered not for His own need but for ours, has not prevailed over the inherent, self-regardingness of human hearts. The Nietzschean 'will to power,' the Darwinian 'survival of the fittest,' the common worldly-wise principles of 'getting on in the world,' all point to an individualistic conception of opportunity which easily harmonizes with human impulse. Christianity, on the other hand, with its basal concept of the solidarity or brotherhood of the race, regards time as an arena of self-sacrifice, where each life in its own way, by its particular ability and influence, gives a contribution to the ultimate 'kingdom of heaven.' 'If,' in effect says the Apostle, 'time is imprisoned in the sphere of self-seeking, buy it back: ransom it from so ignoble and deadening a scheme of life, and your walk will be with Christ.' Redemption of the present, then, is bound up with the Christian view of life as a

self-realization which is possible only through self-abandonment. 'Walk in wisdom toward them that are without, redeeming the time.'

No doubt these thoughts may seem to carry with them an ideal 'for earth too high,' to proclaim a kind of disregard of personal success and ambition, and to exalt a spiritual passion which may appear to leave the ground 'to lose itself in the sky.' When one remembers how many thousands are living a hard life, employing a mediocre ability in an endless struggle to keep their place; how many thousands also, through the mere stress of life, have lost all ambition and initiative,—it might seem more fruitful to appeal to the natural instincts of self-preservation and self-aggrandizement; to call on the multitude to look after self and ignore their neighbours, to proclaim a kind of *saute qui peut* in the general confusion of things: but this way lies madness and the degradation of mankind. Christianity proclaims the duty of

individual activity, self-improvement, the cultivation of our gifts and tastes, the perfecting of every power, and it thereby condemns indolence, paralysis of will, inertness of despair, and drift. But to redeem the time is to consecrate our character and capacity to the kingdom of God; to make our goodness a contribution to the world's happiness; to learn every day how useless and sinful are ingratitude and sullen hopelessness, how much better it is to be kind to people than to stand on our rights or to be haughty and harsh-tempered, how it is possible in thousands of little ways, in every sphere, to cultivate considerateness and charm of manner, how much nobler it is to encourage the best in others by avoiding the spirit of malice and the language of irritation, and 'so to collect about us' (as Stevenson says) 'the interest and love of our fellows, so to multiply our effective part in the affairs of life that we need to entertain no longer the question of our right to be.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

A New Danish Theologian.¹

DANISH contributions to theology and philosophy are so rare and so original that every new one is sure of a welcome. Martensen's works are very far from being obsolete in their English dress. Monrad, Grundtvig, Kierkegaard, Höfding well sustain the fame of Danish freshness and originality. Professor Scharling belongs to the same genus. His discussion of theological prolegomena is delightful for its inner sequence, its lucidity of thought and style, and sweet reasonableness. The standpoint is evangelical Lutheranism. The twenty-one chapters, after an introduction on Theology and Dogmatics, discuss the four questions—God's Revelation, Holy Scripture, the Confession of the Church, and Lutheran Dogmatics. The definitions, classifications of topics, expositions and criticisms are models of their kind. The differences between the Lutheran and the 'Reformed' position, little understood in England, come in for frequent illustration; they are typified in Luther (or Melancthon)

and Calvin. The Protestant scholastics of the post-Reformation age find little favour. The last chapter, characterizing the different stages in the development of modern Lutheranism, is one of the most interesting in the book. Rationalism, Pietism, Speculative Theology, Schleiermacher, Martensen, Ritschl, Dörner, Frank, are briefly but acutely criticised, the good as well as the weak points being recognized. Martensen's great merits suffer somewhat from association with speculative elements borrowed from philosophy and mysticism. One of Professor Scharling's criticisms is that Martensen sets up 'the Christian idea of truth' as, alongside Scripture and the Church, a third criterion of Christian doctrine. Still, despite theosophic and other wanderings, Martensen is easily the unsurpassed representative of Danish faith and theological learning. J. S. BANKS.

Leeds.

A Survey.

BOOKS having some similarity of subject, but written by different authors, are now frequently published in a series. It is quite a modern

¹ *Offenbarung und heilige Schrift.* Dogmatische Erörterungen von C. Henrik Scharling, übersetzt von G. Johannis. Leipzig: Deichert. M.5.

fashion, and nowhere is it so fashionable as in France. Messrs. Bloud et C^{ie} of Paris alone issue something like a score of different series of books all dealing with theology or ethics. We have already mentioned some of Messrs. Bloud's series, but we may mention them again in connexion with the new volumes that have appeared.

First of all there is a series of 'Questions,' divided into a number of smaller series. There are 'Questions Historiques,' of which we have a volume by M. Henri Couget, entitled *Le Clergé Gallo-Romain à la fin du IV^e siècle*; 'Questions Scientifiques,' of which the volume we have seen is on *Les Merveilles de l'Œil*, by Drs. Louis and Paul Murat; 'Questions d'Écriture Sainte,' with a volume entitled *Comment utiliser l'Argument prophétique*, by M. J. Touzard; 'Questions de Sociologie,' of which we have received three volumes—*Pourquoi nous sommes sociaux*, by M. de Clermont-Tonnerre; *Civisme et Catholicisme*, by M. E. Julien; *Art et Pornographie*, by M. George Fonsegrive; and lastly 'Questions Théologiques,' of which two volumes have been issued—*Le Dogme*, by M. P. Charles, and *Qu'est-ce que le Ciel?* which is adapted from the German by M. l'Abbé G. Gazagnol. The price of each volume of the 'Questions' series is Fr.0.60.

Then there are several biographical series. First a 'Série Biographique' with a volume by M. Fernand Laudet entitled *La Sœur Rosalie* (Fr.0.60); next a series with the somewhat similar title of 'Biographies,' of which a volume on *Cardinal Vaughan*, by M. Paul Thureau-Dangin has been published (Fr.1.20). Then the great Theologians are to have a series, and the great Popes another. Professor J. Martin has written on *Thomassin* (Fr.1.20), and M. Paul Deslandres on *Saint Pie V.* (Fr.0.60). Another series is devoted to the Philosophers and Thinkers, and still another to the Fathers of the Church. Three volumes of the Philosophers and Thinkers have appeared—*Buchez*, by M. G. Castella; *Léonard de Vinci*, by Baron Carra de Vaux; and *Charles Fourier*, by M. Albert Lafontaine (Fr.0.60 each), and one of the Fathers—*Saint Justin : sa Vie et sa Doctrine*, by M. l'Abbé A. Béry (Fr.0.60). The Saints are to have a series of their own, which will not only be a very long series, but each volume seems intended to be of a larger size. There is a volume issued on *Sainte Hélène* (Fr.3), by M. R. Couzard, which has a letter of introduction by

Mgr. du Vauroux, Bishop of Agen. The last of the biographical series is a series on foreign writers, of which two volumes have been published, one on *Chaucer* (Fr.2.50), by Professor E. Legouis, and the other on *Les Sœurs Brontë* (2s.), by M. E. Dimnet. The 'Foreign Writers' are much larger volumes than the others (with the exception of the Saints). For fulness and accuracy they are quite fit to stand beside our 'English Men of Letters' and the like, and for charm of style, together with delicacy of psychological insight, we have few volumes in English that can be compared to them.

There is a small series of volumes entitled 'Chefs d'Œuvre de la Littérature Religieuse,' of which three volumes have already been published. The first is a volume of *Sermons* by Bourdaloue (Fr.1.20); the second consists of some *Œuvres choisies* of Fléchier (Fr.1.20); and the third contains the *Prières et Méditations Inédites* of Ernest Hello (Fr.0.60). Along with these may be mentioned a series of Apologetics, of which there are two volumes published—*L'Apologetique* by Mgr. Douais, and *L'Acte de Foi est-il raisonnable?* by R. P. Schwalm (Fr.0.60 each); a devotional series with a volume entitled *Examen de Conscience*, by M. Jean Triollet (Fr.0.60); a series in Liturgics with a volume entitled *Le Martyrologe*, by M. J. Baudot (Fr.0.60); a series on Art and Literature, to which M. Maurice Blondel has contributed *La Psychologie Dramatique du Mystère de la Passion à Oberammergau* (Fr.0.60); and finally a series entitled 'Féminisme,' of which there is published at present a single volume by M. Paul Feyel, under the title of *Les Jeunes Filles Françaises et le Problème de l'Éducation* (Fr.0.60).

Those are nearly all small books, popular in style, and published at a popular price. But there is a more thorough and more expensive series, or rather series of series, which goes by the title of 'Études.' Thus there are 'Études de Théologie et d'Histoire,' the volume in this series being a translation of Professor Hermann van Laak's criticism of Harnack. Its title is *Harnack et le Miracle* (Fr.2). Again, there are 'Études de Philosophie et de Critique Religieuse,' with two excellent volumes—a study in Roman religion entitled *Isis et les Isiaques sous l'Empire Romain* (Fr.1) by M. J. Burel, and an important and valuable contribution to Christian philosophy by M. Ch. Perriollat with the title of *Chrétien et Philosophe* (Fr.3.50); and there are 'Études de

Morale et de Sociologie' with two rather more popular volumes, the one entitled *Nouvelles Orientations de la Morale* by M. F. Palhoriès (Fr.2.50), the other *Les Tendances Sociales des Catholiques Libéraux* by M. l'Abbé Charles Calippe (Fr.3).

But Messrs. Bloud of Paris do not publish all their books in series. There is a volume of extracts from the writings of La Mennais which is issued by itself, beautifully printed on beautiful paper. Its title is *Pages et Pensées catholiques* (Fr.2.50). Perhaps it might be worth while quoting two of the extracts by way of example. Let us take this on the sufferings of mankind:

'Nous avons tous part à ce calice si amer à la nature. N'oublions pas que notre Sauveur y a bu le premier, qu'il l'a épuisé jusqu'à la lie, et, si notre âme aussi est triste jusqu'à la mort, songeons que notre espérance a sa racine dans ces grands mystères de douleur.'

And this from the chapter on 'The Church and Christianity':

'Tout ce qu'il y a de bon, de vrai, de nécessaire et d'utile au genre humain, le Christianisme le renferme, ou comme principe, ou comme conséquence.'

There is also a volume on a subject which seems outside the theological horizon. But that is only to a Protestant; to a Roman Catholic it is very much inside, and very much alive. It is the question of the proper pronunciation of ecclesiastical Latin. The title of the book is *La Réforme de la Prononciation Latine* (Fr.2.50). It is written by M. Camille Couillaut, and there is a preface by the Rev. Dom Pothier, O.S.B. Lastly comes the only bound volume in the list. It is a short and popular *Histoire de l'Église*, by MM. L. David and P. Lorette, one a Professor in Angiers, and the other in Paris (Fr.3).

This very condensed survey may be brought to an end by a reference to two new editions; the one is a new edition of Bossuet's *Exposition de la Doctrine de l'Église Catholique* (Fr.3); the other is a revised and enlarged edition of the fifth volume of Professor Albert Dufourcq's *Histoire de l'Église du III^e au XI^e siècle* (Fr.3.50).

At the Librairie Victor Lecoffre in Paris, Messrs. J. Gabalda et C^{ie} have published a volume containing two long essays dealing with the supernatural in the New Testament. The

subject of the one is our Lord's Resurrection; its author is Professor Jacquier. The subject of the other is the Gospel Miracles, its author being Professor Bouchany. The price of the book is (Fr.3.50). Professor Jacquier's work is now well known in this country, and on the whole we think his strength lies in apologetic writing of this sort more surely than in exposition. He has surveyed the arguments for and against the Resurrection with considerable skill and with perfect fairness. He has brought out clearly the impossibility of denying the fact of the Resurrection without at the same time denying the Person of Christ. Professor Bouchany is not so well known, but he is quite capable of taking his place beside a scholar like Jacquier, although he is perhaps not quite so sensitive to modern movements.

Messrs. Williams & Norgate have issued the third number of *Logos*, concluding the first volume (M.4). Its contents are quite as attractive as those of the first two numbers in which we found so much pleasure, and its authors are quite as eminent. There is first an article by Edmund Husserl of Göttingen on 'Philosophy as Pure Science'; there is next a chapter on the subject of Political Economy, the two divisions being 'Universalism and Individualism' and 'The Problem of "The Law of Nature"'; this chapter is the work of Peter von Struve of St. Petersburg. Then Professor Hans Cornelius of Frankfurt writes on Knowledge as the Recognition of Things in themselves; and this is followed by a paper on Wagner by Leopold Ziegler. But the article of greatest weight is the last; its title is 'Zur Psychologie der Systeme,' and its author Hermann Graf Keyserling. Messrs. Williams & Norgate have also issued a small volume by Professor Holl of Berlin, entitled *Luther und das landesherrliche Kirchenregiment* (M.1.50). Both those volumes are issued in Tübingen by Messrs. J. C. B. Mohr.

From Bender's Buchhandlung in Braunsberg there comes a small volume on *Paulus und die Sklaven zu Korinth* (M.1.50). It is an exposition of 1 Co 7²¹: 'Wast thou called being a bondservant? care not for it: but if thou canst become free, use it rather.' The author is Professor Dr. Alphons Steinman.

The most important foreign book this month

is undoubtedly Guthe's *Bibelatlas*, which is published in Leipzig by H. Wagner and E. Debes. Its size is 18 inches by 12. It consists of thirteen pages of maps, most of the pages containing more than one map, while on the other hand there are three magnificent maps of Palestine occupying a double page. The colouring is effective for the chief purpose of a map, the mountains being light grey and the divisions and printing in red. Thus everything is very clear and distinct, and the whole effect pleasing to the eye. The maps are in historical sequence, each of them

being strictly confined to its own period. Then the index of names at the end enables one to find a place quite readily in each of the maps in which it occurs. The maps also stand in topographical relation, and Dr. Guthe has brought them up to date, basing them on the results of the most recent investigation. But there are still some things to which Professor Driver could have drawn his attention. We doubt, indeed, if he has read the articles on the Geography of Palestine which Dr. Driver contributed to a recent volume of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. The price of the Atlas is M. 12.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., D.LITT., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

Chapter v.

1. Here we have the title of the second series of tablets, the first of which was called 'These are the generations of the heavens and the earth' (2⁴). The original would have been: *Duppu 11. : Annâti tâlidât Adami : Enuma ilâni Adama ibni-ma ina tsalam ilâni epišu. Enuma*, etc., was the title of the account of Adam's creation, corresponding with the Babylonian Story of the Creation, the title of which was *Enuma elis lâ nabû samamu*.

2. The title is followed by a description of what God did; hence the plural 'them' instead of the singular of the title, and the repetition of the phrase *enuma ibni*, which is Hebraized into 'in the day when they were created' (הַיּוֹם הַהוּא). The collective sense of Adam is confined to Hebrew; the Assyrian equivalent would have been *tenisetu* or *amelutu*. In v.², accordingly, we must see an interpolation of the Hebrew translator. As we are referred back by it to 1²⁷, it is possible that the author of chap. 1 and the translator were one and the same. It will be noticed that two alternative renderings of the Assyrian *tsalamu* are given, *zelem* and *dēmûth*, the latter of which was free from the polytheistic and idolatrous associations of *zelem*.

3. The reigns of the antediluvian kings of Babylonia amounted to the astronomical period of 120 sari, or 4,320,000 years, but the system upon which the different lengths of reign were ascribed to the

kings is difficult to discover. The Hebrew text makes it 1656 years from the Creation to the Deluge, and 2056 lunar years, *i.e.* rather more than 2000 solar years, to Abram's migration from Ur, while the Septuagint makes the first period 2262 years (see note on v.²⁵). The Samaritan version reduces the period from the Creation to the Deluge to 1307 years by not allowing any of the antediluvian patriarchs to beget his first son after he is 150 years of age.¹ Josephus reduces the 2262 years of the Septuagint to 2256, but the Septuagint chronology was intended to harmonize with the Egyptian, and from the first year of Menes, the founder of the united monarchy of Egypt, to the end of Manetho's first epoch with the close of the eleventh dynasty and of the First Tomos of his history, is exactly 2263 years (see note on v.²⁵).

Oppert² has suggested that the Massoretic system has been derived from the Babylonian by substituting the week of 7 days (which, according to the Introduction to the Book of Genesis, was a divine institution) for 5 solar years in the Babylonian system, the Babylonians having possessed a week of 5 days as well as a week of 7 days. The two numbers, the Babylonian 432,000 and the

¹ This chronological system has a Sabbatical basis, the birth of Arphaxad, two years after the Deluge, thus occurring in the 187th year of jubilee.

² *La Chronologie de la Genèse* (1878).

Biblical 1656, when divided by 72, are as 6000 to 23. But 23 years are equivalent to 1200 weeks of 7 days, and consequently to 6000 years in the Babylonian system; hence 5 Babylonian years, that is to say, a 'soss' of months, would correspond with a Biblical week. The 'soss' or 60 was the Babylonian mathematical unit, and the year was divided into 12 months, as the Zodiac was into 12 signs.

Whatever the origin of the system may have been, it is impossible to discover the principle upon which the different ages were assigned to the patriarchs at which sons were born to them, or their deaths took place. The Septuagint adds 100 years to the ages of the patriarchs at the time their first sons were born, except in the cases of Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech, who were already over a hundred years of age at the time, according to the Heb. text. The Samaritan proceeds on exactly the opposite principle, subtracting 100 years from the age of Jared, 120 years from that of Methuselah, and 129 years from that of Lamech.

20. Reduced to 847 years by the Samaritan version.

21. Enoch (חֲנוֹךְ), 'the priest' (found also in the inscriptions of Southern Arabia), corresponds with Enwe-dhur-anki ('Priest of the temple of the Bond of Heaven and Earth'), the priest-king of Sippara, in the Babylonian list (see above 4¹⁷). The calendar was of priestly origin, and the calendrical character of Enoch has long been recognized. He is the 7th patriarch, and so corresponds with Tisri, the first month of the Hebrew civil year, but the 7th of the Babylonian and Hebrew ecclesiastical year, and his age, 365 years, answers to the 365 days of the Babylonian solar year.

22. The phrase 'walked with God' is taken from v.²⁴, in which, therefore, we must see an old expression adopted by the translator instead of his ordinary 'lived.'

24. Common Assyrian phrases are *ina ili-ya alâku*, 'to walk with my God,' and *ilu ittalka iddâ-ya*, 'the God walked beside me.' So Cyrus says of Merodach that 'as a friend and comrade he walked beside me' (cf. also the phrase quoted in the note on 4⁷). Here the original would have been: *Enu (Khanuku) ina ili ittalka-ma yânu; ilu ilqi-su*. According to the Babylonians, it was Utu-napistim who was translated without dying, after the Deluge; the gods, he is made to

tell Gilgames, *ilqu-inni-ma ina ruqi ina pî narâti ustisibu-inni*, 'took me and settled me afar off at the mouth of the rivers,' i.e. in the Babylonian paradise. As Utu-napistim was called Atra-khašîš or Khašîš-atra, 'the very wise,' it is possibly the source of the Arabic name Idrîs given to Enoch. Hānoch (Enoch), 'priest,' is also literally 'the instructed' or 'initiated one' (Arab. *ḥanaka*, 'to understand'), and may therefore be regarded as a very fair translation of Atra-khašîš. In the Babylonian legend of the first man Adamu the same title is given to Adamu, while in the Cainite genealogy in Genesis the title is transferred to the son of 'the Smith.'

25. The current Septuagint text has 167 instead of 187. This, however, would place the death of Methuselah 14 years after the Deluge, and the reading is unknown to, or ignored by, Josephus, Africanus, and Epiphanius. St. Augustine alludes to the variant reading (*De Civ. Dei*, xv. 13. 3.; *Quæstt. in Heptateuch.* i. 2).

27. Reduced to 720 years by the Samaritan version.

28. According to the Septuagint, 188 years.

29. Lamech names Noah as Adam named Seth; Seth was born to replace Abel the shepherd; Noah is born to replace Cain the agriculturist (as indeed is clearly stated in 9²⁰), on whose account 'the soil' of Babylonia had been cursed (4¹¹). The Septuagint, not understanding the passage, has endeavoured to extract sense out of it by changing 'console us for' into 'cause us to cease from.' But it follows from the words of Lamech that Noah, instead of being the hero of the Deluge, ought to have been the son of the first man. He must, therefore, have been moved from the position to which he originally belonged, and his name substituted for that of the builder of the ark. In Babylonian this was Utu-napistim, 'the Sun-god is life,' the polytheistic character of which would explain its rejection by the Hebrew writer.¹ See note on 9²⁰.

The explanation of the name by the non-Assyrian Heb. verb נִיחַם, *niḥam*, shows that we have here (as

¹ The title of Atra-khašîš, 'the very wise,' applied to Utu-napistim, was also applied to other heroes of the antediluvian age of Babylonia, to whom the origins of civilization were ascribed. This might explain the substitution of Nukhum for Utu-napistim, one Atra-khašîš being replaced by another. Moreover, as will be shown in the note on 9²⁰, Nukhum (or Nukhum-ili?) was originally the first man himself rather than the son of the first man.

in 4²⁵) a Hebrew gloss. But *niham* is not an explanation of נֹחַ, 'Noah,' which has no final *m*. In the Babylonian cuneiform of the Khammu-rabi period, however, the name is written Nukhum, with the usual 'mimination,' and occurs among the West Semitic names in the legal documents. It must, therefore, have been the Babylonian cuneiform Nukhum which the Hebrew writer had before him when he connected it by a punning etymology with the verb *niham*. The name really means 'rest,' and is an abbreviation of names like Nakhum-Dagan. Nukhum also occurs, as well as the hypocoristic Nukhi-ya. נָח, *zeh*, 'this one,' is used here like the Assyrian *annu*. The rest of the verse, however, shows no trace of an Assyrian original.

31. According to the Septuagint, 753 years; according to the Samaritan version, 653.

32. Noah was 600 years old, *i.e.* a Babylonian *ner*, when the flood came (7⁶); consequently his three sons were born 100 years before that event. To the Babylonian sexagesimal system, with its *ross* of 60, its *ner* of 600, and its *sar* of 3600, the later decimal system has accordingly been attached.

Shem is the West Semitic god Šumu or Šamu, from whom the Khammu-rabi dynasty traced its descent, its first king being Šamu-abi, 'Shem is my father.' In the West Semitic compound names of that period, Šumu—literally 'the Name'—is frequently substituted for the name of some individual deity which happened to be the first element in the compound. In Shem, therefore, we must see the eponym of the Western Semites of Southern Arabia and the West during the Khammu-rabi age.

Ham in the O.T. is the eponym of Egypt, which in the Mosaic age included what was then the Egyptian province of Canaan. The origin of the name is unknown. The Mendaite 'Book of Adam' changes it into Yamin.

Japhet is the Iapetos of Cilicia, who is stated by Stephanus Byzantinus (*s.v.* 'Adava') to have been one of the seven Cilician gods, children of the Earth and Sky. He thus represented the Hittite and other populations of Asia Minor. Greek mythology made him the husband of Asia and father of all mankind, and counted Atlas and Prometheus among his sons.

The triad had its origin in Babylonia, where the State religion, after the amalgamation of the Sumerian and Semitic elements, arranged the hierarchy of the gods under the triad of Anu, the Sky, Ellil, the Earth, and Ea, the Water. The

human triads, whether sons of Adam, of Lamech, or of Noah, would represent the same system of arrangement.

From this analysis it results that:

- (1) Babylonian documents lie at the back of Gn 4-5. One of these was entitled *Enuma ilâni Adama ibni* (or *ibnu*), and had been incorporated into a later document entitled *Annâti tâlîdât*.
- (2) There were also documents of West Semitic origin, but written in cuneiform and the Babylonian language.
- (3) Different versions of the same story existed: in some cases one version was Babylonian, and the other version West Semitic.
- (4) These documents and versions lay before a Hebrew writer who made use of them, and who also wrote in cuneiform characters and the Babylonian language.
- (5) The Babylonian list of ten antediluvian kings which is not older than the age of Khammu-rabi was known to him, and he has harmonized his history with it as the Septuagint has harmonized the Biblical chronology with the Egyptian.
- (6) His work has been translated into Hebrew by a writer who has made several additions to it, and whose translation has been partly literal, partly paraphrastic. The transference of the name of Nukhum (Noah) from the son of the first man to the hero of the Deluge seems to have been due to him.
- (7) In some cases the meaning of the Babylonian has been misunderstood, thus introducing difficulties into the narrative.
- (8) The etymologies are due to the translator, who in the case of Noah supposed the final 'mimination' to belong to the root of the name (5²⁰).
- (9) Alternative renderings were given in some instances of a Babylonian word, just as in the cuneiform tablets alternative renderings are sometimes given of a Sumerian word; hence the expression in 4²².
- (10) Corruptions have crept into the Hebrew text since it was first written, some of which may be subsequent to the period when the Septuagint translation was made.
- (11) The reference to the ironsmith in 4²² cannot be earlier than about 1600 B.C.

In the Study.

For the Sanctuary.

Thanksgiving.

For Life.

We thank Thee for our life, with all its blessings of health and strength, of comfort and privilege; for all its charities and affections, and its means of doing good.—*Presbyterian Forms of Service.*

We thank Thee for the labours and the joys of these mortal years.—RUFUS ELLIS.

For God's Providence in Nature.

O Thou, who art the hope of all the ends of the earth, and on whom the eyes of all do wait, who crownest the year with Thy goodness, who openest Thy hand and fillest all things living with plenteousness, every day do we give thanks unto Thee, and praise Thy name for ever and ever, through Jesus Christ our Lord.—W. K.

We praise Thy name that we have seen Thy promises fulfilled in the fulness of the earth. Thou hast provided for our wants and answered our prayers for daily bread. We thank Thee for all the joy that is ours in believing that Thou art our Father who ever worketh to provide, not only for the supply of our wants, but also for our happiness.—*Public Prayers by a Congregational Minister.*

We give Thee thanks, Almighty God, for the bread of the body that perisheth, and we beseech Thee to give us that bread by which man's higher life is fed.—GEORGE DAWSON.

For God's Care and Guidance.

We yield Thee thanks, O Lord our God, Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, for that Thou hast sheltered, assisted, and defended us, and hast brought us through the past time of our life, and hast guided us to this hour, and dost vouchsafe to receive us.—*Liturgy of the Greek Church.*

We thank Thee for all the indications of Thy goodness and over-ruling providence, seen in the history of our beloved land.—*Public Prayers by a Congregational Minister.*

We thank Thee for all Thou hast done for us, and for all Thou art to us. We thank Thee for Thy faithfulness to our fathers. We thank Thee for Thy faithfulness to Thy people now. We

thank Thee for all the grace to come.—THEODORE MONOD.

Almighty God, Father of all mercies, we Thine unworthy servants do give Thee most humble and hearty thanks, for all Thy goodness and loving-kindness to us, and to all men. We bless Thee for our creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life; but above all, for Thine inestimable love in the redemption of the world, by our Lord Jesus Christ; for the means of grace, and for the hope of glory.—*Coptic Litany of St. Basil.*

We bless Thy holy name for all the undeserved favours which we have received at Thy gracious hand this day: for life and health, for food and raiment, and for deliverance from dangers and difficulties of mind, body, or estate.—J. ASHE.

We give Thee thanks, yea, more than thanks, O Lord our God, for all Thy goodness at all times and in all places, because Thou hast shielded, rescued, helped, and guided us all the days of our lives, and brought us unto this hour.—*Liturgy of St. Mark.*

May we lift our hearts to Thee this day in great thankfulness, humbly acknowledging Thy mercy and Thy truth, Thy large and tender providence, Thy nearness to us at all times, Thy Spirit of Wisdom, and Might and Peace, the works and the joys, and the discipline of earth which Thou dost appoint, the promises that lay hold of things to come.—RUFUS ELLIS.

We thank Thee for blessings around us and within, for mercies known and unknown, for all that Thou hast granted, for what Thou hast withheld, and for everything yet in store for us. Most of all we bless Thee for that wherewith Thou drawest us to Thyself, and by which Thou art making us Thine own, through Jesus Christ our Lord.—W. K.

We bless Thee for Thy many daily benefits. Surely Thou dost follow us step by step with punctual providences, and with patient pardons.—A. MACLAREN.

For Spiritual Gifts.

Eternal praise and thanks be given unto Thee, dear God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which hast blessed us with all spiritual blessing in heavenly things by Christ, in that Thou hast,

chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world was laid, that we should be without blame before Thee through Him.—*Christian Prayers* (1566).

Hear our thanksgiving unto Thee for all the joy that Thou puttest into mortal life; but chiefly for the joy that comes of sin forgiven, weakness strengthened, victory promised, life eternal looked for.—GEORGE DAWSON.

We would thank Thee for all the benefits that we have received from Thy goodness: it is to Thy blessing we owe what success we have found. Every opportunity for doing good; every impulse in the right way; each victory we have gained over ourselves; every thought of Thy presence, O Father; every silent but loving glance on the example of our Pattern, Thy Son our Lord—all are alike Thy gifts to us.—M. SAILER.

Lord, we thank Thee for the liberty which comes to our emancipated spirit through the adoption which Thou hast made us to enjoy.—C. H. SPURGEON.

O Father Almighty, we give Thee thanks that Thou hast called us unto godliness and to the remission of sins.—*Liturgy of the Greek Church*.

Almighty and everlasting God, heavenly Father, we give Thee humble thanks, that Thou hast vouchsafed to grant us a knowledge of Thyself, and faith in Thee.—W. K.

Blessed be Thy name, there are some sins which Thou hast helped us to overcome, and now they are trodden beneath our feet with many a tear that we should ever have been in bondage to them.—C. H. SPURGEON.

We thank Thee that that light which shows the sinful affections which are hidden in our hearts can also help us to see Christ as the Saviour from sin.—*Public Prayers by a Congregational Minister*.

We thank Thee for all the light there is, but send us more light. We thank Thee for what life there is among Christians, but send more of it.—C. H. SPURGEON.

For the Incarnation and Work of Christ.

We thank Thee that the Word has become flesh and dwelt among us. We thank Thee for all the ministration of His life, and all the graciousness of His words and works. And we bless Thee that He has shown us the Father and scattered for ever the doubts and fears that spring in guilty hearts. But most of all we praise Thee that He

has died for all, and therefore is King of all.—A. MACLAREN.

We adore Thee and give thanks to Thee, O Son of the living God, most gracious Jesus, who for us wast conceived in the Virgin's womb, and becamest a tender infant.—H. S. LUNN.

O gracious and bounteous Lord God, who furnishing our offering acceptest it, blessed be Thou for ever and ever.—C. G. ROSSETTI.

We thank Thee for the Risen Saviour, for the loving Christ, for the reigning King; for our Intercessor in Thy presence who has gone in to prepare a place for us, and comes to us through all the days with the gifts of His grace and Spirit, and will come at last to take us to Himself.—A. MACLAREN.

Chiefly are we bound to praise Thee for the glorious Resurrection of Thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord; for He is the very Paschal Lamb which was offered for us, and hath taken away the sin of the world: who by His death hath destroyed death, and by His rising to life again hath restored to us everlasting life.—*Book of Common Prayer*.

Our glory, and our thanksgiving, and our blessing to our Lord Jesus Christ, for His life-giving words to us; and to His Father, who sent Him for our salvation; and to His living and holy Spirit, who giveth us life.—*Liturgy of St. James*.

For the Holy Spirit.

O Lord, we thank Thee for that Spirit of the Lord which searcheth the hearts and the reins of the children of men; and we pray that we may come to the light that our deeds may be made manifest to ourselves.—A. MACLAREN.

We bless Thee for the Spirit that came of old, and still comes, from Him who was so filled with the Father, and so expressive of the Father's glory—the Spirit of holy inspiration, the Spirit of light and truth, the Spirit of comfort and love, the Spirit, not of bondage and fear, but of liberty and sonship.—S. A. TIPPLE.

We praise Thee, O Thou God of truth, for every measure of the Holy Spirit which Thou hast bestowed upon us during the past day, in His enlightening, refreshing, and sanctifying influences; for the comfort of Thy holy Word, and the rich treasures of spiritual knowledge that are revealed therein.—ISAAC ASHE.

We thank Thee for the world without wherein

Thy glory is revealed, where day unto day uttereth speech of Thee, and night unto night certifieth knowledge. We thank Thee still more for the world within, where Thy Spirit dwelleth and daily worketh with our own, where Thou revealest Thyself secretly to the souls which Thou hast made.—W. K.

For the Love and Forbearance of God.

We thank Thee for undeserved mercies. We thank Thee for the continuance of often misused benefits. We thank Thee that Thou dost not pluck away our joys when we forget the Hand that gives them, but that Thou dost continue with patience, endless because it is Divine, wooing us to Thyself, and hoping that the mercy of God may lead us to repentance.—A. MACLAREN.

We give Thee thanks, O our God, our mercy, who hast vouchsafed to lead us to a conception of Thee, that in Thine unbounded goodness Thou hast patience with us, waiting for the amendment of our lives.—ST. ANSELM.

O Lord, we thank Thee for Thine infinite patience; we thank Thee that Thou sufferest long and bearest with us still.—M. DODS.

We thank Thee, Lord, for the love without beginning which chose us or ever the earth was; for the love without measure which entered into covenant for our redemption; for the love without failure which in due time appeared in the person of Christ and wrought out our redemption, for that love which has never changed.—C. H. SPURGEON.

For the Saints.

We bless Thee for as many as are openly confessing Christ as their Saviour and Lord, and pray that they may continually be upheld by Thy grace and power.—*Public Prayers by a Congregational Minister.*

O Lord, God of our fathers, we bless Thy holy name, Thy grace and mercy, for all those who have gone before us to rest in Thee; all, in all

vocations, who have pleased Thee.—CHRISTINA G. ROSSETTI.

We thank Thee for that true Light shining in our world with still increasing brightness. We thank Thee for all who have walked therein, and especially for those near to us and dear, in whose lives we have seen this excellent glory and beauty.—RUFUS ELLIS.

For Communion.

Almighty and ever-living God, we most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, and dost assure us thereby of Thy favour and goodness towards us; and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of Thy Son, which is the company of all faithful people; and are also heirs through hope of Thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and passion of Thy dear Son.—*Book of Common Prayer.*

God of all grace, we thank Thee that at this holy table Jesus Christ is before our eyes openly set forth crucified—wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities; and we praise Thee that in this bread which we break we have the communion of His broken body.—*Presbyterian Forms of Service.*

We thank Thee, O Lord, for the abundance of Thy mercies, whereby we have been made worthy to partake of Thy heavenly table.—*Liturgy of St. James.*

For the Bible.

We thank Thee for all the consolations given in Thy Word, which help us to bear our pain with submission, and which dispel our fears.—*Public Prayers by a Congregational Minister.*

Our Father, which art in heaven, our hearts are full of gratitude to Thee for Thy Word.—C. H. SPURGEON.

Contributions and Comments.

John v. 2.

Dr. HUNT's new (eighth) volume of *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* includes a Christian amulet (No. 1151), assigned, with a query, to the fifth century, which supplies us with some evidence as to the way in which 5² was read in that age. God is addressed as ὁ Θεὸς τῆς προβατικῆς κολυμβήθρας. Two revisers (see Milligan and Moulton's *Commentary in loc.*) failed to persuade the company to eject *sheep gate* in favour of *sheep pool*, even in a margin: here is welcome support for what certainly seems the better reading. Cf. Holtzmann³ on the passage, making the same view. On the other hand, the quotation from John's Prologue, which the papyrus gives later as a charm, ends with *χωρεῖς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἐν ὃ γέγονεν*. This tells against a punctuation which has found much favour, given in R. V. *margin*. The weight of the papyrus is naturally greater in the first case than in the second.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Didbury.

Circumambulation.

PROFESSOR HILLEBRANDT's interesting contribution on 'The Practice of Circumambulation,' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, June 1911, raises two points which seem to require further elucidation.

1. *The Extent of the Practice.*—Following Caland, Professor Hillebrandt holds that the 'counter' movement 'originated in, and is restricted to, the Indo-Aryan epoch.' But this is not the view of Brinton, who, after quoting instances of the ceremonial circuit in Germany, France, and Peru, goes on to say, 'Numberless other examples of this universal rite might be mentioned, a rite the shadow of which still falls among us in the processional and recessional of high Protestant churches. Among primitive peoples and in the folk-lore of modern nations, it develops into the forms which are known as 'the sinistral and dextral circuits,' depending on whether the procession is from right to left or the reverse, connected doubtless with the motion of the heavenly bodies, and with the reverse of that motion, each appropriate to various forms of worship. Throughout the American tribes this is always a point of the greatest importance, and con-

stantly appears, not merely in their religious exercises, but in their social customs, their arts, and their habits of life.'¹

Traces of similar ideas are found elsewhere in regions far remote from Indo-Aryan influence. Amongst primitive peoples the distinction between the right and left is apt to be regarded as of the utmost importance. When the *mbenda*, or field rat, crosses the path of the West African native from left to right 'it is a good sign; not so good when it crosses from right to left.'² In this connexion we may note Nöldeke's rather tantalizing statement that among the ancient Arabs 'the animals that crossed a man's path and the direction in which they moved alike conveyed a meaning.'³ It would be interesting to know whether the Arabian superstition coincided with the West African; but in any case it is difficult to accept Professor Hillebrandt's suggestion that 'the almost perfect agreement between Indian and Old Celtic notions' 'may be due to a historical or rather prehistoric relation between the two races.' It seems better to account for the agreement by the well-ascertained similarity of the working of the human mind in all races of men.

2. *The Origin of the Practice.*—This is generally referred to the movement of the celestial bodies, particularly the sun. 'To an observer who turns his face toward him in our hemisphere, the sun moves from the left to the right.' No doubt this is the true explanation of the circular movements connected with sun-worship, but it is doubtful whether this is sufficient to warrant the statement that 'it is quite intelligible that in all ceremonies connected with gods or men, and which are meant to be auspicious, the circular movement should follow the course of that great Giver of life and good fortune, whereas the movement in the opposite direction will indicate death, evil, ill-luck.' It seems more probable that in many cases the belief in both the auspicious and inauspicious movements arose from the 'right handedness' of the race. It is from this that we get the word 'sinister' = on the left hand. The motion to the right, whether circular or otherwise, is invariably regarded as a

¹ Brinton, *Religions of Primitive Peoples*, p. 183.

² Dennett, *At the Back of the Black Man's Mind*, p. 139.

³ *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. i. p. 671.

good omen among right-handed peoples; whereas the movement in the opposite direction is injurious and maleficent. In Christ's picture of the Last Judgment it would require a bold theorizer to discern any connexion between the movements of the heavenly bodies and the movement of the sheep to the right hand and the goats to the left. There is a natural tendency in man to 'keep to the right'—so far as his physical movements are concerned—and this in itself is sufficient to account for many of the beliefs connected with the circular movements in the processions of primitive peoples.

WILLIAM UPRIGHT.

Hindley.

Titus and the Acts.

WHY is Titus not mentioned in the Acts? Bishop Lightfoot (*Bibl. Essays*, p. 281) suggests that he was not well enough known; Sir W. Ramsay (*St. Paul*, p. 390) that he was a relative of St. Luke. May not a better explanation be that for large sections of the book he was St. Luke's first-hand authority? It seems not unlikely that the very full information about Antioch came from him.

I. In the important Antiochian section of Acts—roughly speaking, chaps. 11¹⁹–15⁴¹, omitting chap. 12¹⁻²⁴—we have evidence of first-hand knowledge, e.g. the origin of the Church in Antioch, the duration of the ministry of Barnabas and Saul, the origin of the name 'Christian,' the circumstances of the first 'collection for the saints' (11¹⁹⁻³⁰), the names of the chief teachers, and the circumstances of the first mission of Barnabas and Saul (13¹⁻³).

II. It seems likely that the same person accompanied the apostles on this journey—at any rate, as far as Pisidian Antioch. He was:

(i.) An eye-witness. Cf. 13⁹ ἀπεινίσας, ¹⁴ ἐκάθισαν, ¹⁶ ἀναστὰς δὲ Παῦλος καὶ κατασείσας τῇ χειρὶ, ⁵¹ ἐκτιναξάμενοι, etc.

(ii.) The full account of proceedings at Pisidian Antioch may be due to the interest of a native of the other Antioch, while he is careful to distinguish it from his own city (13¹⁴).

(iii.) There are a few signs of unity of style, e.g. the frequent use of χαίρειν, χαρά, often with παρακαλεῖν, παράκλησις, 11²³ 13^{15, 52} 15³⁰ (cf. St. Paul's description of Titus, 2 Co 7^{7, 18}); ἐπιστηρίζειν, 14²² 15^{32, 41}; διελθεῖν, 11¹⁹ 13⁶; χεῖρ Κυρίου, 11²¹ 13¹¹.

III. The person is not St. Luke himself.

(i.) There is no careful itinerary, as in the 'we' sections. Cf. the description of the crossing from Troas to Philippi (16^{11, 12}), with the journey from Perga to Pisidian Antioch (13¹⁴).

(ii.) It is unlikely that the 'beloved physician' would have omitted any reference to such a detail as that of Gal 4¹³.

IV. Of all the known companions of St. Paul, Titus seems best to fulfil the conditions.

(i.) He is connected with Antioch by Gal 2³. Whether this be the visit of Ac 11³⁰, or 15^{1st}, is immaterial.

(ii.) He was a convert of St. Paul (Tit 1⁴), and his conversion cannot well have taken place later than Ac 11³⁰. He seems to have been older than Timothy, and perhaps on this account, and on account of his larger experience, was sent in his stead to deal with the difficult situation in Corinth. (See 2 Cor.)

(iii.) He appears to have been specially interested in the 'collection for the saints,' and, indeed, may have been sent to Corinth because he had had previous experience in organizing it (2 Co 8⁶, προεπήρατο). If the visit of Gal 2 be identical with that of Ac 11³⁰, this is natural; but in any case, if what has been said already holds good, this interest may have arisen from his presence at Antioch at the first inception of the collection.

(iv.) If, on the other hand, St. Paul's second visit in Galatians corresponds with St. Luke's third (Ac 15), then the position of Titus (συνπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον, Gal 2¹) may have been analogous to that of the six brethren who accompanied St. Peter to the house of Cornelius (Ac 10²³ 11¹²).

E. H. OAKLEY.

Halstead Vicarage.

Hallelujah.

1. 'HALLELUJAH' occurs more than twenty times at the end or beginning of Psalms, and is always rendered 'Praise ye the Lord' in the A.V. There is *one* exception: in Ps 115¹⁸ it is 'Praise the Lord.' Is this intentional, or an accidental remainder from the Prayer Book version?

2. The Divine name 'Jah' occurs separately more than twenty times in the Hebrew Bible; it is always remarked on the margins of the R.V. There is *one* exception: Ps 135³. Is this intentional or accidental? In Hebrew is there neither

'Hallelujah' as one word (as in v.¹), nor 'Jehovah,' as in the second part of the verse, 'for the LORD is good,' but 'JAH,' as in v.⁴. In v.⁴ the margin has 'Jah,' but not for v.³. What is the reason?

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

The First Commandment in Hebrew.

It is well known that there is a double accentuation of the Ten Commandments in the Hebrew Bibles. But most modern impressions, even the latest and best—those of Kittel and Ginsburg—have overlooked that for the first commandment there is a *threefold* accentuation.

In 1902, E. Kautzsch inserted into the twenty-seventh edition of his Grammar, § 15 *p* the remark:

'The *earliest* (*Das Ursprüngliche*) seems to have been a *third* accentuation, which demanded עֲבֹדָיָהּ and פָּנֵי, and made vv.^{2, 3} the first commandment.'

Now this important *Athnach* is missing in most modern impressions, even in those of Kittel and Ginsburg, though both profess to follow Jacob ben Chayyim. The latter has clearly עֲבֹדָיָהּ: three accents—*Rebi'a*, *Athnach*, *Sillug*. The same accentuation is found, for instance, in the edition of Cornelius Adelkind (Venice: Bomberg, 1548); Menasseh ben Israel (Amsterdam, 1635); for the last time, to my knowledge, in the edition of A. Hahn (1832); but not longer in that of Theile or Letteris. Theile mentions it only among the *Variae Lectiones*. The omission in the Bible of Ginsburg is the more strange, as he has had this *Athnach* in his *Massorah*, iv. p. 435, and follows it at the foot of his text in the 'Palestinian' Recension, where, *vice versa*, no use is made of the *Rebi'a* of his text. The threefold division is therefore:

1. *Rebi'a*, connecting v.² with vv.³⁻⁶ to one clause.
2. *Athnach*, connecting vv.^{2, 3} to one clause, vv.⁴⁻⁶ to another.
3. *Sillug*, separating v.² as one clause from the rest.

The middle, the best division, has disappeared from our modern reprints, although their avowed standard has it. Is that not strange? See on it also the remarks of J. H. Michaelis in his edition of 1720.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Didache xi. 4, 5 and John iv. 19, 40.

'BUT let every prophet coming unto you be received as the Lord. But he shall not stay except one day; but if there be need (he shall stay) the second also; but if he stay three days, he is a false prophet.'

Here we find *the prophet* received as the Lord, but not allowed to stay *more than two days*.

May we not trace the origin of these instructions to a familiarity with the Fourth Gospel? There we find the Samaritan woman saying to Jesus, 'Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet' (Jn 4¹⁹). Combine this with v.⁴⁰, 'The Samaritans therefore asked him to stay amongst them; and he stayed there two days.'

Here is a record of *our Lord* being received as a prophet and staying two days.

H. HIGHFIELD.

Wesley College, Colombo.

Psalms xiv. 1.

THE usual handling of this text seems to me just to reverse the Psalmist's meaning. It is ordinarily taken to be his explanation of atheism. On the whole, this is the view adopted in the Great Text Commentary in the February number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. Is it not rather the Psalmist's explanation of folly? No doubt folly and atheism interact, the one grows with the other. But it is of some importance to discover which of the two in the Psalmist's view comes logically first. And the usual procedure is to argue that irreligion, religious doubts, and so on, are the outcome of 'folly,' that is, that decay of religion proceeds from moral degeneration. I beg to suggest that the meaning of the text is the opposite, that a man becomes a fool in the Psalmist's sense, because he has ceased to have any real reverence for God. He hath said *in his heart* there is no God. That is the probably unconscious principle on which he is acting. Mr. Jowett's 'burst of hilarity' is ingenious, but is it in harmony with the words *in his heart*? The fool sinks to his folly because, though he may be surprised to hear it, the principle of his conduct is that there is no God, because he is a practical atheist. It is, I think, in harmony with scriptural teaching,

that morality rests on religion, and not *vice versa*. But to take the text as an explanation of atheism, as is so often done, is to adopt the *vice versa* view.

W. D. NIVEN.

St. Andrew's Manse, Blairgowrie.

‘Τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωῆα.’

THE difficulty about the passages Mt 12³⁸⁻⁴⁰ 16^{1, 4} and parallels is as old as the Gospels themselves. The Evangelists, as well as modern commentators, have been unable to agree about the meaning of our Lord's answer to the demand for a sign from heaven.

The question is (1) whether Mark is right in making Jesus refuse any sign, or (2) whether Matthew and Luke are right in so far that Jesus did qualify His refusal by referring to some event of moral and religious significance, like the preaching of Jonah; and (3), if we accept His qualification as original, what is the event referred to, and in what way did Jesus conceive it to be a sign to that generation?

Matthew and Luke agree that Jesus pointed to τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωῆα as an exception, but they disagree about the meaning of this sign. It is now generally recognized by critics that the explanation in Mt 12⁴⁰ is an unsuccessful attempt of the Evangelist to interpret the meaning of Jesus. But it is uncertain whether the different and more probable interpretation in Lk 11³⁰ is the actual word of Christ. At any rate, it is not free from difficulty. In v.²⁹ Jonah is given as the only sign to ‘this generation’; and it is in the words in italics that the difficulty is greatest. Moreover, the explanation in v.³⁰ seems to ignore, or to be ignorant of, the exact form of this perplexing saying. The Son of Man is now Himself to be the sign to ‘this generation,’ as Jonah had been a sign to the ancient Ninevites. No doubt v.³⁰ expresses a truth, and may be a genuine word of Jesus even in its present context, but its thought is not certainly a part of His reply as recorded in the previous verse.

Some scholars have been led by these considerations to prefer the reply given in Mark, which makes our Lord's refusal absolute. It might be argued from the method and aim of His work that Christ would have refused absolutely to give any sign which seemed miraculous in order to induce

belief in His office and authority. But against the account of the Temptation, which points in this direction, we must set the reply which Christ sent back to the imprisoned Baptist. In any case, it would be precarious to declare that Jesus did not point to any event as a sign, and that the exception in Matthew and Luke is not original. The very difficulty of the clause makes it hard to imagine how it could have been added if Jesus made no exception in His reply. And, apart from such conjecture, we have some positive evidence in our Lord's teaching that He did refer to ‘signs of the times,’ and, in particular, to the Ministry and baptism of John.

1. Jesus saw in John the spiritual fulfilment of the prophecy of the return of Elijah, and in John's death a sign of the fate that awaited the Christ Himself (cf. Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, p. 87).

2. The demand for a sign (or a sign of Christ's authority) in Mk 11²⁸ is met by a reference to the divine mission of John. ‘Jesus’ answer to the challenge is anything but enigmatical. It is an appeal to the great Sign from heaven, the coming of Elias effecting the Great Repentance’ (B. W. Bacon, *The Beginnings of Gospel Story*, p. 163. He thinks that ‘this was a “greater matter than Jonah,” and therefore the generation which ignored it stood condemned in the presence of the repentant Ninevites’).

Now, in view of what has been said, is it possible that there has been a mistake about the reference of the word Ἰωῆα? The suggestion that I would venture to propose for the judgment of scholars is that ‘Jonah’ may have been substituted for an original ‘John.’ Four points in favour of this conjecture may be mentioned.

1. Confusion is known to have occurred between the two names. Professor P. W. Schmiedel, speaking of the name ‘John’ in *Ency. Bib.*, c. 2505, says: ‘Of the various equivalents, *Iowan* comes nearest the most original form (*Iowan*) so far as the consonants, *Iowan* so far as the vowels, are concerned, whilst the second *v* has disappeared in the Græcizing of the termination. The same thing has happened also in the forms *Iowan* and *Iowa*, in which, moreover, by the coalescence of the vowels, the distinction between this name and that of *Iowan* = יוֹנָה, ‘Jonah,’ has disappeared.’

2. The difficulties of interpretation would be removed, and the thought would come into line

with Jesus' teaching about the significance of John in the development of God's purpose.

3. The juxtaposition of the saying (Mt 12⁴¹) with reference to Jonah, together with the motives underlying the two explanations of the saying, may have caused the misunderstanding.

4. The words τοῦ προφήτου are probably an addition, and so the title here would agree with our Lord's other references simply to 'John.'

On this hypothesis, the reply of Jesus was, 'An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of John.'

CAVENDISH MOXON.

South Croydon.

Harnack on the Acts.

In his recent work on the *Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels* (Eng. tr., Williams & Norgate), Dr. Harnack finds confirmation for his view of the early date of the Acts in the entire absence from its pages of any reference to the martyrdom of Paul. 'We note that nowhere in the Acts is either St. Peter or St. Paul so treated as if his death was presupposed; we rather receive the contrary impression.' Harnack further points out that it would be natural to Luke's method if some such allusion were found in the form of a prediction. We have, for example, the predictions of the famine, of Paul's imprisonment at Jerusalem, and of the fate of the ship. 'There are prophecies concerning events of minor importance, while there is nothing about the great event of all!' (p. 98).

I wish to draw attention to a prediction not here referred to by Dr. Harnack, which seems to have a direct bearing on the matter in hand. It is contained in the vision recorded in Ac 23¹¹: ὡς γὰρ διεμαρτύρω τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, οὕτω σε δεῖ καὶ εἰς Ῥώμην μαρτυρῆσαι. There is no special emphasis laid on the parallelism, as there is, e.g., in Ac 1¹¹; nevertheless, the natural interpretation is clearly that Paul is to bear the same kind of witness in Rome as he has done in Jerusalem. As Dr. Knowling says in his commentary, the words 'intimate that the Evangelist regarded the Apostle's visit to Rome as *apex Evangelii*, so far as his present work was concerned.' But if in the meanwhile, the Apostle's witness-bearing at Rome had reached the climax

of a martyr-death, it seems very unlikely from a critical point of view that Luke would have recorded the prediction in a form which limits it to the kind of experience he had had at Jerusalem. Either the writer is reproducing his information with a punctilious care for which he does not always get credit, or he is writing at a time when the fatal issue of the Apostle's visit to Rome had not occurred.

C. ANDERSON SCOTT.

Westminster College, Cambridge.

2 Cor. xii. 9 in the Revised Version.

To the 'Interlinear Bible' which has twice 'power' in 2 Co 12⁹, as pointed out by J. M. Dickie (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, p. 377), must be added (1) the edition 'issued in connection with the centenary of the B.F.B.S., 1904' (Oxford: University Press, 1903. Nonpareil); and (2) the 'Two-Version Bible' (Oxford, Brevier, 8vo, Preface 'C. F. Gloucester, Nov. 1899'). It will be interesting to learn the history of this variation.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

The Honeycomb in Luke xxiv.

In the D.C.G. i. 747, Lucien Gautier repeats the view of Dean Burgon on the honeycomb of Lk 24⁴² (which passage Westcott-Hort had styled a singular interpolation, evidently from an extraneous source, written or oral), that it is very difficult to imagine that such a clause as that established itself universally in the sacred text, if it be spurious, while it is much less difficult to explain how such a clause became omitted from any manuscript if it be genuine. He appeals finally to the proneness to polemize against the Gnostics, who made large use of honey in their solemn 'mysteries,' and who may have appealed for support to this text, referring to Carl Schmidt, *Gnostische Schriften in koptischer Sprache*, Leipzig, 1892, pp. 203, 508. But he, too, omits to quote the passage which offers the most curious parallel, and is of the highest importance for the textual question, from the legend on Joseph and Asenath, first published in full by Batiffol (*Studia Patristica, Études d'ancienne littérature chrétienne fasc.*, i. 2, Paris, 1889-1890, pp. 1-87). There an angel gives to Asenath heavenly food,

after he has eaten himself a piece of it, which consists of a *honeycomb*, κηρίον, made by the bees of paradise from the roses in the paradise (p. 64). After she has eaten a small bit of it, the angel says to her: ἰδοὺ δὴ ἔφαγες ἄρτον ζωῆς καὶ ποτήριον ἔπιες ἀθανασίας καὶ χρίσματι κέχρισαι ἀφθαρσίας. Already before, it was promised to her: φαγεί ἄρτον ζωῆς εὐλογημένον καὶ πιεῖ ποτήριον ἐμπεπλησμένον ἀθανασίας καὶ χρίσματι χρισθήσῃ εὐλογημένῃ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας. Also Joseph partook of the same food: ἐσθίει ἄρτον εὐλογημένον ζωῆς καὶ πίνει ποτήριον εὐλογημένον ἀθανασίας καὶ χρίεται χρίσματι εὐλογημένῳ ἀφθαρσίας. In the Syriac recension (published by J. P. N. Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, iii. 1870) a leaf is missing, just before the passage of the honeycomb begins; but the latter is completely preserved, p. 31, line 7 f. Batiffol ascribes the legend

to the 5th century. If that date is correct, its value for our textual question would not be great, but M. R. James says (*D.B.*, i. 162): 'The probability is that the original is as early as the 3rd century.' As the passage on the honeycomb is quoted in Schürer's *History of the Jewish People* (German ed., iii.³ 290, ⁴ 399), and by James ('gives her to eat of a mystic honeycomb, on which the sign of the cross is made'), it seems rather strange that this passage should have escaped the commentators and textual critics, but I know of no reference to it. In the *Ency. Bibl.*, 2106, says A. R. S. Kennedy: 'A piece of broiled fish and of an honeycomb was doubtless a familiar combination'; the author of our legend does not seem to have thought so.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Entre Nous.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Donald M. Henry, Whithorn.

Illustrations for the Great Text for October must be received by the 1st of September. The text is Ps 118²⁴.

The Great Text for November is Ps 119¹⁰⁵:

'Thy word is a lamp unto my feet,
And light unto my path.'

A copy of Emmet's *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels*, or Wheeler Robinson's *Christian Doctrine of Man*, or any volume of the Great Texts, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for December is Ps 126⁶:

'Though he goeth on his way weeping,
bearing forth the seed;
He shall come again with joy, bringing
his sheaves with him.'

A copy of Dean's *Visions and Revelations*, or of Wheeler Robinson's *Christian Doctrine of Man*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for January is Ps 139⁷:

'Whither shall I go from thy spirit?

Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?'

A copy of Scott's *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, or Kennett's *Early Deals of Righteousness* together with any volume of the 'Epoch Makers' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for February is Is 28¹⁶:

'Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone of sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste.'

A copy of any volume of the Great Texts, or Durell's *The Self-Revelation of Our Lord*, or Emmet's *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels*, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.